Ed.

Edward Clark Porter.

3 1735 060 398 884

591.05

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
University of Pittsburgh Library System

http://www.archive.org/details/worksofeminentmo04stil

A Rational Account

OF THE

GROUNDS

OF

Protestant Religion:

BEING A

VINDICATION

OF THE

Lord Archbishop of CANTERBURY's *Relation of a Conference*, &c.

From the pretended ANSWER by *T.C.*

Wherein the true GROUNDS of FAITH are cleared, and the False discovered; The CHURCH of ENGLAND Vindicated from the imputation of SCHISM; and the most important particular Controversies between Us and Those of the *Church of ROME* throughly Examined.

With A REPLY to Mr. *J. Serjeant* his Third APPENDIX, containing some Animadversions on this Book.

By the Right Reverend Father in GOD,

EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, D.D.

Late Lord Bishop of *WORCESTER*.

The Fourth Volume.

LONDON:

Printed for *Henry* and *George Mortlock*, at the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1709.

TO HIS MOST Sacred Majesty CHARLES II.

By the Grace of God King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.

Most Gracious Sovereign,

SINCE that great Miracle of *Divine Providence* in Your *Majesty's* most happy *Restauration*, we have seen those who before Triumphed over the *Church* of *England* as *dead*, as much expressing their Envy at her *Resurrection*. Neither could it otherwise be expected, but that so sudden a recovery of her former *Lustre*, would open the mouths of her weak but contentious *Adversaries*, who see her shine in a *Firmament* so much above them. But it is a part of her present *Felicity*, that they are ashamed

of that inſulting Queſtion, *What is become of your Church now?* and are driven back to their old impertinency, *Where was your Church before* Luther? They might as well alter the date of it, and ask Where ſhe was before your *Majeſty's* Reſtauration? For ſhe only ſuffered an *Eclipſe* in the late Confuſion; no more did ſhe, though of a longer ſtay, in the times before the *Reformation.* And it was her great *Honour*, that ſhe was not awakened out of it (as of old they fancy'd) by the *beating of Drums*, or the rude *clamours* of the *People*; but as ſhe Gradually regained her *Light*, ſo it was with the *Influence* of *Supreme Authority.* Which hath cauſed ſo cloſe an union and combination of *Intereſts* between them, that the *Church* of *England*, and the *Royal Family*, have like *Hippocrates* his *Twins* both *wept* and *rejoyc'd* together. And nothing doth more argue the excellent Conſtitution of our *Church*, than that therein the purity of *Chriſtian Doctrine* is joyned with the moſt hearty Acknowledgment of your *Majeſty's Power* and *Supremacy.* So that the *Loyalty* of the Members of it can neither be ſuſpected of private Intereſt, or of depending on the pleaſure of a Foreign *Biſhop*, but is inlaid in the very *Foundations* of our *Reformation.* Which ſtands on thoſe two *Grand Principles* of *Religion* and *Government*; The *giving to God the things that are God's, and to* Cæſar *the things that are* Cæſar's. And as long as theſe two remain unſhaken, we need not fear the continuance and flouriſhing of the *Reformed Church* of *England*, and your *Majeſty's Intereſt* in the Members of it. Which it is hard to conceive

ceive thoſe can have any Zeal for, who are the buſie *Factors* among us for promoting ſo oppoſite an *Intereſt* as that of the *Church* of *Rome*. For what a Contradiction is it, to ſuppoſe it conſiſtent with your *Majeſty's Honour* and *Intereſt*, to rob your *Imperial Crown* of one of the richeſt *Jewels* of it, to expoſe your *Royal Scepter* to the *mercy* of a *Foreign Prelate*, to have another *Supreme Head* acknowledged within your *Dominions*, and thereby to cut off the dependance of a conſiderable part of the Nation wholly from *Your Self*, and to exhauſt the *Nation* of an Infinite *Maſs* of *Treaſure* meerly to ſupport the *Grandeur* of the *See* of *Rome*? They who can make Men believe that theſe things tend to *Your Majeſty's* Service, think they have gained thereby a conſiderable ſtep to their *Religion*, which is by baffling Mens Reaſon, and perſwading them to believe Contradictions. But if, notwithſtanding the received Principles of their *Church*, any have continued Faithful in their Loyalty to *Your Majeſty*, we have much more cauſe to attribute it to their *Love* to their *King* and *Country*, than to their *Religion*. We deny not, but there may be ſuch rare Tempers which may conquer the *malignity* of *Poiſon*, but it would be a dangerous *Inference* from thence, that it ought not to be accounted hurtful to Humane Nature. If any ſuch have been truly *Loyal*, may they continue ſo, and their number increaſe: and ſince therein they ſo much come off from themſelves, we hope they may yet come nearer to us, whoſe *Religion* tends as much to the ſettling the only ſure *Foundations* of *Loyalty*, as theirs doth to the

weakning of them. And were this the only Controverſie between us, there need not many Books be written to perſwade Men of the Truth of it.

But if theſe Men may be believed, we can as little pleaſe *God* on the Principles of our *Church*, as they *Your Majeſty* on the Principles of theirs. A ſtrange Aſſertion! and impoſſible to be entertain'd by any but thoſe who think there is no ſuch way to pleaſe *God*, as to renounce the judgment of Sence and Reaſon. And then indeed we freely confeſs there are none ſo likely to do it, as themſelves. With whom Men are equally bound to believe the greateſt *Repugnancies* to Senſe and Reaſon, with the moſt *Fundamental Verities* of *Chriſtian Faith*. As though no *Faith* could carry Men to Heaven, but that which can, not only *remove*, but *ſwallow Mountains*. Yet theſe are the Perſons who pretend to make our Faith *Infallible*, while they undermine the *Foundations* of it, as they advance *Charity* by denying *Salvation* to all but themſelves, and promote true *Piety* by their groſs *Superſtitions*. By all which they have been guilty of *debauching Chriſtianity* in ſo high a meaſure, that it cannot but heartily grieve thoſe who honour it as the moſt excellent *Religion* in the World, to ſee its *beauty* ſo much *clouded* by the *Errors* and *Superſtitions* of the *Roman Church*.

That theſe are *great* as well as *ſad Truths*, is the deſign of the enſuing Book to diſcover. Which I humbly preſent to *Your Majeſty's* Hands, both

both as it is a *Defence* of that *Cauſe* wherein *Your Intereſt* is ſo highly concern'd, and of that *Book* which *Your Royal Father* of moſt *Glorious Memory*, ſo highly honoured, not only by his own peruſal and approbation, but by the commendation of it to his *Deareſt Children*. On which account, I am more encouraged to hope for your *Majeſty's* acceptance of this, becauſe it appears under the *Shadow*, as well as for the *Defence*, of ſo great a *Name*. And ſince *God* hath bleſſed *Your Majeſty* with ſo happy and rare a mixture, of *Power*, and *Sweetneſs of Temper*, May they be ſtill imployed in the *Love* and *Defence* of our *Reformed Church*; which is the hearty Prayer of

Your Majeſty's moſt Loyal

and Obedient Subject,

E. Stillingfleet.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

IT is now about a twelve-month, ſince there appeared to the World a Book, under the Title of Dr. *Laud*'s *Labyrinth*; but, with the uſual ſincerity of thoſe Perſons, pretended to be Printed ſome Years before. It is not the buſineſs of this Preface to enquire, Why if Printed then, it remained ſo long unpubliſhed, but to acquaint the Reader with the ſcope and deſign of that Book, and of this which comes forth as a Reply to it. There are three Things mainly in Diſpute between us, and thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, *viz.* Whether they, or we, give the more ſatisfactory account of the *Grounds* of *Faith?* Whether their *Church*, or *ours*, be guilty of the charge of *Schiſm*? And, Whether their *Church* be juſtly accuſed by us of introducing many *Errors* and *Superſtitions?* In the handling of theſe, all our preſent Debate conſiſts; and therefore, for the greater Advantage of the Reader, I have diſtributed the whole into three diſtinct Parts: which I thought more commodious, than carrying it on in one continued Diſcourſe. And, leſt our *Adverſaries* ſhould complain, that we ſtill proceed in a deſtructive way, I have not only endeavoured to lay open the palpable weakneſs of their Cauſe, but to give a rational account of our own Doctrine in oppoſition to theirs. Which I have eſpecially done in the great

great Controverſie of the *Reſolution* of *Faith*, as being the moſt difficult and important of any other. I hope the Reader will have no cauſe to blame me for falſe or impertinent Allegations of the *Fathers*, ſince it hath been ſo much my buſineſs to diſcover the fraud of our *Adverſaries* in that particular: which I have chiefly done from the ſcope and deſign of thoſe very Books, out of which their teſtimonies are produced. In many of the particular Differences, I have made uſe of ſeveral of their late Writers againſt themſelves; both to let them ſee, how much *Popery* begins to grow weary of itſelf; and, how unjuſtly they condemn us for denying thoſe things, which the moderate and rational Men of their own ſide diſown, and diſpute againſt as well as we; and chiefly to undeceive the World, as to their great pretence of *Unity* among themſelves. Since their Diviſions are grown to ſo great a height both at home and in Foreign Parts, that the Diſſenting Parties mutually charge each other with *Hereſie*, and that about their great *Foundation* of Faith, *viz.* the *Popes Infallibility*; The *Janſeniſts* in *France*, and a growing party in *England*, charging the *Jeſuits* with *Hereſie* in aſſerting it, as they do them with the ſame for denying it. As to myſelf, I only declare, that I have with freedom and impartiality enquired into the Reaſons on both ſides, and no Intereſt hath kept me from letting that ſide of the ballance fall, where I ſaw the greater weight of Reaſon. In which reſpect, I have been ſo far from diſſembling the force of any of our *Adverſaries* Arguments, that if I could add greater weight to them, I have done it; being as unwilling to abuſe myſelf as the world. And therefore I have not only conſulted their greateſt Authors, eſpecially the three famous *Cardinals*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Perron*, but the chiefeſt of thoſe, who, under the name of *Conciliators*, have put the faireſt Varniſh on the Doctrine of that *Church*. However, I have kept cloſe to my *Adverſary*, and followed him through all his windings, from which I return with this ſatisfaction to myſelf, that I have vindicated his *Lordſhip* and *Truth* together. As to the ſtyle and way of writing I uſe, all that I have to ſay, is that my deſign hath been to joyn clearneſs of Expreſſion, with evidence of *Reaſon*. What ſucceſs I have had in it, muſt be left to the Reader's judgment; I only deſire him to lay aſide *prejudice* as much in judging, as I have done in writing; otherwiſe I deſpair of his doing me right, and of my doing him good. For, though reaſon be tractable and ingenuous, yet Prejudice and Intereſt are invincible things.

Having

Having done thus much by way of Preface, I ſhall not detain thee longer, by a particular Anſwer to the impertinencies of our *Author*'s Preface, ſince there is nothing contained therein, but what is abundantly anſwered in a more proper place. And I cannot think it reaſonable to abuſe ſo much the Readers *Appetite*, as to give him a tedious *Preface* to cloy his Stomach. If any, after peruſal of the whole, ſhall think fit to return an Anſwer, if they do it fairly and rationally, they ſhall receive the ſame civility; if with clamour and impertinency, I only let them know, I have not leiſure enough to kill *Flyes*, though they make a troubleſome noiſe. If any ſervice be done to *God* or the *Church*, by this preſent Work, next to that *Divine Aſſiſtance*, through which I have done it, thou oweſt it to thoſe great Pillars of our *Church*, by whoſe Command and Encouragement I undertook it. Who the Author was of the Book, I anſwer, I have been the leſs ſolicitous to enquire, becauſe I would not betray the weakneſs of my Cauſe, by mixing perſonal matters in Debates of ſo great importance. And, whether he be now living, or dead, I ſuppoſe our *Adverſaries* cannot think it at all material, unleſs they judge that their Cauſe doth live and dye with him.

PART I.

Of the Grounds of Faith.

CHAP. I.

The Occaſion of the Conference, and Defence of the *Greek* Church.

T. C's. *Title examined and retorted. The Labyrinth found in his Book and Doctrine. The occaſion of the Conference about the Churches Infallibility. The riſe of the Diſpute about the* Greek *Church, and the Conſequences from it. The Charge of Hereſie againſt the* Greek *Church examined, and ſhe found, Not-guilty, by the concurrent Teſtimony of Fathers, General Councils, and Popes. Of the Council of* Florence *and the Proceedings there; That Council neither General nor Free. The diſtinction of Ancient and Modern* Greeks *diſproved. The Debate of the* Filioque *being inſerted into the Creed. The time when, and the Right by which it was done, diſcuſſed. The riſe of the Schiſm between the* Eaſtern *and* Weſtern *Churches, mainly occaſioned by the Church of* Rome.

THat which is the common Subtilty of *Malefactors*, to derive, if poſſible, the imputation of that Fault on the perſons of their Accuſers, which they are moſt liable to be charged with themſelves, is the great Artifice made uſe of by you in the *Title* and *Deſign* of your *Book*. For there being nothing which your Party is more juſtly accuſed for, than involving and perplexing the Grounds of Chriſtian Faith under a Pretext of Infallibility in your Church, you thought you could not better avoid the *Odium* of it, than by a confident recrimination: And from hence it is that you call his Lordſhips Book a *Labyrinth*, and pretend to diſcover his *abſtruſe turnings*, *ambiguous windings* and *intricate Meanders*, as you are pleaſed to ſtile them. But thoſe who will take the pains to ſearch your Book for the *diſcoveries* made in it, will find themſelves little ſatisfied but only in *theſe*, that no cauſe can be ſo bad, but intereſſed Perſons will plead for it; and no writing ſo clear and exact, but a perplexed Mind will imagine nothing but *Meanders* in it. And if dark paſſages and intricate windings, if obſcure ſenſe and perplexed §. 1.

conſequences, if uncertain wandrings and frequent ſelf-contradictions may make a writing be call'd a *Labyrinth*, I know no Modern *Artiſt* who comes ſo near the skill of the *Cretan Artificer* as your ſelf. Neither is this meerly your own fault; but the nature of the *Cauſe* whoſe Defence you have eſpouſed, is ſuch, as will not admit of being handled in any other manner. For you might as ſoon hope to perſwade a Traveller that his neareſt and ſafeſt way was through ſuch a *Labyrinth* as that of *Creet*, as convince us that the beſt and ſureſt Reſolution of our Faith is into your *Churches Infallibility*. And while you give out, that all other Grounds of *Chriſtian Faith* are uncertain, and yet are put to ſuch miſerable ſhifts in defence of your own, inſtead of eſtabliſhing the Faith of *Chriſtians*, you expoſe *Chriſtianity* it ſelf to the Scorn and Contempt of *Atheiſts*; who need nothing more to confirm them in their *Infidelity*, than ſuch a ſenſeleſs and unreaſonable way of proceeding as you make uſe of, for laying the Foundations of *Chriſtian Faith*. Your great Principle being, that no Faith can be Divine, but what is Infallible; and none Infallible, but what is built on a Divine and Infallible Teſtimony; and that this Teſtimony is only that of the preſent Catholick Church; and that Church none but yours: And yet after all this you dare not ſay the Teſtimony of your Church is *Divine*, but only *in a ſort* and *after a manner*. You pretend that our Faith is vain and uncertain, becauſe built only on Moral Certainty and Ratonal Evidence; and yet you have no other Proof for your Churches Infaillibility, but the motives of Credibility. You offer to prove the Churches Infallibility independently on *Scripture*; and yet challenge no other Infallibility but what comes by the promiſe and aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*, which depends wholly on the Truth of the *Scripture*. You ſeek to diſparage *Scripture* on purpoſe to advance your *Churches Authority*, and yet bring your greateſt Evidences of the *Churches Authority* from it. By which *Authority* of the *Church* you often tell us that *Chriſtian Religion* can only be proved to be Infallibly true, when if but one error be found in your *Church*, her Infallible Teſtimony is gone, and what becomes then of *Chriſtian Religion?* And all this is managed with a peculiar regard to the Intereſt of *your Church*, as the only *Catholick Church*, which you can never attempt to prove but upon ſuppoſition of the *Truth* of *Chriſtianity*, the belief of which yet you ſay depends upon your *Churches* being the *True* and *Catholick Church*. Theſe, and many other ſuch as theſe will be found the rare and coherent Principles of your Faith and Doctrine, which I have here only given this taſte of, that the Reader may ſee with what honour to your ſelf and advantage to your Cauſe, you have beſtowed the *Title* of *Labyrinth* on his *Lordſhips Book*.

But yet you might be pardonable, if rather through the weakneſs of your Cauſe, than your ill management of it, you had brought us into theſe amazing *Labyrinths*; if you had left us any thing whereby we might hope to be ſafely directed in our paſſage through them: Whereas you not only endeavour to put Men out of the true Way, but uſe your greateſt Induſtry to keep them from a poſſibility of returning into it: By not only ſuggeſting falſe Principles to them, but decrying the uſe of thoſe things which ſhould diſcover their Falſity. For although the judgment of Senſe were that which the *Apoſtles* did appeal to (*that which we have ſeen and*
1 John 1, 3. *heard——declare we unto you*) although that were the greateſt and ſureſt evidence to them of the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*; although *Chriſt* himſelf
Mark 16. 14. *condemned them for their unbelief and hardneſs of heart, becauſe they believed not them which had ſeen him after he was riſen*; yet according to your Principles, Men muſt have a care of relying on the judgment of ſenſe in Mat-

ters

ters of Faith, leſt perchance, they ſhould not believe that great *Affront* to humane Nature, the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Neither are Men only deprived of the judgment of Senſe, but of the concurrent uſe of *Scripture* and *Reaſon*; for theſe are pretended to be uncertain, fallible, nay, dangerous without the Churches Infallibility: So that the ſhort of your Grounds of eſtabliſhing Faith, is, If we will find our way, we muſt renounce the Judgment of Senſe and Reaſon, ſubmit our ſelves and Scripture to an *Infallible Guide*, and then you tell us we cannot miſs of our way; when it is impoſſible for us to know our *Guide*, without the uſe of thoſe things which we are bid to renounce. Theſe things laid together make us admire more at your *Confidence* than *Invention* in making the current Title of your Book to be Dr. *Laud*'s *Labyrinth*, in which it is hard to ſay, whether your Immodeſty or Blindneſs be the greater.

But as though you were the only *Heroes* for aſſerting the *Chriſtian Cauſe*, and all others but more *ſubtle betrayers* of it, you begin your Book with a moſt ingenious compariſon *of the learned labours of thoſe of your Church to the ſtately Temple of* Solomon; *and the artificial, but peſtiferous Works of all Heretical Authors* (i. e. all but your ſelves) *to Labyrinths and intricate Dungeons.* In which only your Diſcretion is to be commended, in placing this at the entrance of your Book; for whoſoever looks but further into it, and compares it with that you pretend to anſwer, will not condemn the choice of your Similitudes, but your forgetfulneſs in miſapplying them. But it matters not what Titles you give to the Books of our *Authors*, unleſs you were better able to confute them: And if no other Book of any late *Proteſtant* Writer hath been any more diſcovered to be *of this intangling nature*, than this of his Lordſhip (whom you call *our grand Author*) is by you, you may very juſtly ſay of them as you do in the next words, *they are very liable to the ſame Reproach*: In which we commend your Ingenuity, that when you had ſo lately diſparaged our Authors and Writings, you ſo ſuddenly wipe off thoſe *Aſperſions* again by giving them the deſerved name of *Reproaches*. When you ſay his Lordſhip's Book *is moſt artificially compoſed*, we have reaſon to believe ſo fair a Teſtimony from a profeſſed Adverſary; but when notwithſtanding this you call it a *Labyrinth*, we can interpret it only as a fair Plea for your not being able to anſwer it. And who can blame you for calling that a *Labyrinth* in which you have ſo miſerably loſt your ſelf? But, in pity to you, and juſtice to the Cauſe I have undertaken, I ſhall endeavour with all kindneſs and fairneſs to reduce you out of your ſtrange entanglements into the plain and eaſie Paths of Truth; which I doubt not to effect by your own Clew *of Scripture and Tradition*, by which you may ſoon diſcover what a *Labyrinth* you were in your ſelf, when you had thought to have made *directive Marks* (as you call them) for others to avoid it.

§. 2. p. 1. p. 2.

To omit therefore any further Preface, I ſhall wait upon you to Particulars; the firſt of which is, *the Occaſion of the Conference*, *which* (you ſay) *was for the ſatisfaction of an honourable Lady, who having heard it granted in a former Conference, that there muſt be a continual viſible company ever ſince Chriſt teaching unchanged Doctrine, in all Points neceſſary to Salvation; and finding* (it ſeems) *in her own reaſon that ſuch a Company or Church muſt not be falliable in its teaching, was in queſt of a Continual, Viſible, Infallible Church, as not thinking it fit for unlearned Perſons to judge of particular Doctrinals, but to depend on the judgment of the true Church.* The Queſtion then was not concerning a *Continual* and *Viſible Church*, which you acknowledge was granted, but concerning ſuch a *Church* as muſt be *infallible* in all ſhe teaches, (and, if ſhe be infallible, according to your Do-

§. 3. p. 3.

ctrine of Fundamentals, whatever ſhe teaches is neceſſary to Salvation) which that *Lady* thought neceſſary to be firſt determined, becauſe, ſaith Mr. *Fiſher*, *It was not for her, or any other unlearned Perſons, to take upon them to judge of Particulars, without depending upon the judgment of the true Church*; which ſeeming to allow of ſome uſe of our own judgment, ſuppoſing the Churches Authority, you pervert into theſe words, *Not thinking it fit to judge*, &c. *but to depend*, &c. But let them be as they will, unleſs you gave greater Reaſon for them, it is not material which way they paſs. For his *Lordſhip* had returned a ſufficient Anſwer to that Pretence (which you are content to take no notice of) in ſaying, *That it is very fit the People ſhould look to the judgment of the Church before they be too buſie with Particulars. But yet neither Scripture, nor any good Authority denies them ſome moderate uſe of their own Underſtanding and Judgment, eſpecially in things familiar and evident, which even ordinary Capacities may as eaſily underſtand as read. And therefore ſome Particulars a Chriſtian may judge without depending.* To which *you*, having nothing to ſay, run poſt to the Buſineſs of *Infallibility*: For when it was ſaid, *The Lady deſired to rely on an Infallible Church, therein*, his Lordſhip ſays, *neither the Jeſuit nor the Lady her ſelf ſpake very adviſedly: For an Infallible Church denotes a particular Church, in that it is ſet in oppoſition to ſome other particular Church that is not Infallible.* Here now you begin your diſcoveries: For you tell us, *he makes this his firſt Crook in his projected Labyrinth; which is apparent to any Man that has Eyes, even without the help of a Perſpective.* As ſeldom as *Perſpectives* are uſed to diſcern the turns of *Labyrinths*, nothing is ſo apparent, as that your Eyes or your Judgment were not very good when you uſed this Expreſſion. For I pray, what *Crook* or *Turn* is there in that, when a *Lady* demanded an *Infallible Church* to her *Guide*, to ſay, that by that Queſtion ſhe ſuppoſeth *ſome particular Church* as diſtinct from, and oppoſite to others, to be *infallible?* No, ſay you, *ſhe ſought not any one particular Church infallible; in oppoſition to another Church not infallible; but ſome Church, ſuch as might without danger of error direct her in all Doctrinal Points of Faith.* Rarely well diſtinguiſh'd! Not *any* particular Church, but *ſome* particular Church. For if ſhe enquired after *ſome Church, which, without danger of Error, might direct her in all Doctrinal Points of Faith*, doth ſhe not thereby imply, that ſome other Church might bring her into danger of Error, under pretence of directing her in Matters of Faith? And if this be *ſome particular fallible Church*, the other muſt be *ſome particular infallible Church?* And is it poſſible to conceive ſome Church that may err in directing, and ſome other that may not err, without ſome particular Church being taken in oppoſition to ſome other Church? But you would fain perſwade us that the force of his Lordſhip's Argument reſts wholly *upon the importance of the Particle* a *or* an, *which cannot be applyed but to Particulars*, which you very learnedly diſprove: Whereas the main ſtrength of what his Lordſhip ſays, depends upon the nature of the Queſtion, and the manner of propoſing it. For the *Lady* enquiring after ſuch a *Church* whoſe judgment ſhe might rely on as to the Matters in diſpute in the Chriſtian World, muſt mean ſuch a *Church* whoſe Communion muſt be known as diſtinct from other *Churches* which are *not infallible*; for otherwiſe ſhe might be deceived ſtill. And if you give a pertinent Anſwer to her Queſtion, you muſt ſhew her ſome ſuch *Church* as an *Infallible Guide*, which can be no other in this caſe, but ſome particular Church conſidered as diſtinct from others. For a general Anſwer concerning the Infallibility of the *Catholick Church*, without ſhewing how the Infallible Judgment of that *Church* may be known, can by no means

P. 2. Sect. 2.

P. 3 Sect. 3. n. 2.

means reach the Case in hand: Which doth not meerly respect an Infallibility in the Subject, but such an Infallibility as may be a *sufficient Guide in all Doctrinal Points of Faith.* When you say therefore, *she meant no other than the Universal visible Church of Christ*, you must tell us how the *Universal visible Church* can become such an *Infallible Guide* in the Matters in Controversie between those *Churches*, which yet are *Members* of that *Universal visible Church.* For the notion of the *Universal Church* not being in its nature confined to any one of these Parties, but all of them concurring to the making of it up, can no more be an *Infallible Guide* in the *Matters in difference*, than the common notion of *Animal* can direct us in judging what Beings are *Sensitive* and what *Rational.* Therefore though you would fain deceive the World under a pretence of the *Catholick Church*, yet nothing can be more evident, than that in the question what *Church*, must be a *guide in Doctrinal Points of Faith*, it must be understood of some *Church* as distinct from other *Churches*, which ought not to be relied on as infallible Guides. But the subtilty of this is, that when you challenge *Infallibility* to your *Church*, we should not apprehend her as a *particular Church*, but as the *true Catholick Church*, which is a thing so every way absurd and unreasonable, that you had need use the greatest Artifices to disguise it, which yet can deceive none but such as are resolved to be deceived by them. For any one who *had his Eyes in his Head might discern without a Perspective*, as you speak, that *Churches* of several and distinct Communions from each other were placed in competition for *Infallibility:* For Mr. *Fisher*'s next words are, The Question was, *Which was that Church?* Do you think he means, Which was that *Universal visible Church?* Certainly not: for the nature of the Question supposes several *Churches:* Now I think you do not believe, there are several *Universal visible Churches.* And it immediately follows, *A Friend of the Ladies would needs defend that not only the* Roman, *but the* Greek *Church was right*; to which Mr. *Fisher* answers, *That the* Greek *Church had erred in Matter of Doctrine.* Can any thing be more plain, than that this *Question* doth relate to *Churches* considered severally, and as under distinct Communions and Denominations? And therefore notwithstanding your pitiful Pretences to the contrary, this Question can be no otherwise understood than, as his Lordship said, *of some particular Infallible Church, in opposition to some other particular Church which is not Infallible.* And if you judge this *an affected Mistake*, as you call it, *your discerning Faculty* will be as liable to Question as your Churches Infallibility. Page 3.

That you might seem to avoid the better the force of his Lordship's following Discourse against *Bellarmine* about the Infallibility of the particular *Church* of *Rome*; you first tell us, *That it is sufficient for a Catholick to believe that there is an Infallibility in the Church, without further obligation to examine whether the particular Church of* Rome *be infallible or no.* Which is an egregious piece of Sophistry. For, put case a Man believes the *Catholick Church* of *all Ages* Infallible, but not of *any one particular Age* since the *Apostles* times; suppose a Man believe the *Catholick Church* of the *present Age* Infallible, but not of *any one particular Communion*, but as it takes in those common Truths wherein they are all agreed; will you say this is sufficient for a *Catholick* to believe without obligation to examine further? If you will speak it out, and, I dare say, you shall not have much thanks at *Rome* when you have done it. But the Mystery is, If a Man believes the *Roman Church* only, to be the *Catholick Church*, it is no matter whether he enquires whether the *Catholick Church* be only at *Rome* or no. It is not the place, but the Communion of the *Roman Church* which is now enquired after in §. 4.

the

the queſtion of *Infallibility*; although I cannot ſee but thoſe places out of the *Fathers* which are produced to prove the *Roman Church* Infallible, will hold for the continuance of that Infallibility in that particular place of *Rome*. For St. *Cyprian* ſaith expreſly of the *Romans*, *that they are ſuch to whom Perfidia* (what ever be meant by it) *cannot have acceſs*. St. *Jerome* ſaith, *The Roman Faith admits no Deceits into it*. *Gregory Nazianzene*, that *Rome retains the ancient Faith*. Not that I think any of theſe places do in the leaſt import the Infallibility of the *Roman Church* (as will be ſhewed in its proper place) but that, on ſuppoſition that *Infallibility* were implyed in them, they would hold for the *Infallibility* of the particular *Roman Church*. And therefore *Bellarmin* underſtood what he did when he produced theſe places to that purpoſe, eſpecially the *Apoſtolical See* remaining at *Rome*, as he ſuppoſeth himſelf in this part of the *Queſtion* which he there diſcuſſeth. Either therefore you muſt aſſert that which his Lordſhip learnedly proves, *viz.* That no ſuch thing as Infallibility is intended by any of theſe Citations, or elſe that it muſt extend to the particular *Roman Church*. And when you deny this *to be an Article of Faith among Catholicks, that the particular Roman Church* (the Apoſtolical See remaining there) *is Infallible*, prove at your leiſure from any of theſe Citations that the *Church* within the *Roman Communion* is Infallible and not the particular *Roman Church*. And from what hath been hitherto ſaid, I am ſo far from ſuſpecting *his Lordſhip's Candour*, as you do, that I much rather ſuſpect your judgment, and that you are not much uſed to attend to the Conſequences of things, or elſe you would not have deſerted *Bellarmin* in defence of ſo neceſſary and pertinent a Point as the *Infallibility* of the particular *Church* of *Rome*.

Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, & Eccleſiam Principalem, &c. nec cogitare, eos eſſe Romanos ad quos perfidia habere non poteſt acceſſum. Cypr. l. 1. c. 3. *Scito, Romanam fidem ejuſmodi præſtigias non recipere.* Hierony. Apol. 3. c. Ruff. *Roma ſemper fidem retinet.* Greg. Nazianz. carm. de vitâ ſuâ.

Bellarm. de Pontifice Rom. l. 4. c. 4. Sect. 1.

Page 4. Secondly, You anſwer to his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe concerning *Bellarmin's* Authorities, *That you cannot hold your ſelf obliged to take notice of his pretended Solutions, till you find them brought to evacuate the Infallibility of the Catholick or the Roman Church in its full latitude, as Catholicks ever mean it, ſave when they ſay the particular Church of Rome.* But taking it in as full a Latitude as you pleaſe, I doubt not but to make it appear that the *Roman Church* is the *Roman Church* ſtill, that is, a particular *Church* as diſtinct from the Communion of others, and therefore neither *Catholick* nor *Infallible*: Which I muſt refer to the place where you inſiſt upon it, which I ſhall do without the imitation of your Vanity, in telling your Reader as far as *eighthly and laſtly* what fine Exploits you intend to do there. But uſually thoſe who brag moſt of their Valour before-hand, ſhew leaſt in the Combat, and thus it will be found with you. I ſhall let you therefore enjoy your ſelf in the pleaſant thoughts of your noble intendments, till we come to the tryal of them; and ſo come to the preſent Controverſie concerning the *Greek Church*.

The Defence of the Greek *Church.*

§. 5. It is none of the leaſt of thoſe Arts which you make uſe of for the *perplexing* the *Chriſtian Faith*, to put Men upon inquiring after an *Infallible Church*, when yet you have no way to diſcern which is ſo much as a *true Church*, but by examining the *Doctrine* of it. So that of neceſſity the Rule of Faith and Doctrine muſt be certainly known, before ever any one can with ſafety depend upon the judgment of any *Church*. For having already proved that there can be no other meaning of the Queſtion concerning the *Church*, as here ſtated, but with relation to *ſome particular Church* to whoſe Communion

nion the party enquiring might joyn, and whoſe judgment might be relyed on; we ſee it preſently follows in the debate, *Which was that Church*; and it ſeems, as is ſaid already, *a Friend of the Ladies undertook to defend that the* Greek *Church was right.* To which Mr. *Fiſher* anſwers, *That the* Greek *Church had plainly changed, and taught falſe in a Point of Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghoſt:* and after repeats it, *that it had erred.* Before I come to examine how you make good the charge you draw up againſt the poor *Greek Church* in making it *err fundamentally*, it is worth our while to conſider upon what account this Diſpute comes in. The Inquiry was concerning the *True Church*, on whoſe judgment one might ſafely depend in *Religion.* It ſeems, two were propounded to conſideration, the *Greek* and the *Roman*; the *Greek* was rejected *becauſe it had erred:* From whence it follows, that the Diſpute concerning the *Truth* of *Doctrine* muſt neceſſarily precede *that* of the *Church:* For by Mr. *Fiſher*'s confeſſion and your own, *A Church which hath erred cannot be relyed on*; therefore Men muſt be ſatisfied whether a *Church* hath *erred* or no, before they can judge whether ſhe may be relyed on or no. Which being granted, all the whole *Fabrick* of your Book falls to the ground; for then, 1. Men muſt be *Infallibly certain* of the *Grounds* of *Faith* antecedently to the *Teſtimony of the Church:* For if they be to judge of a *Church* by the *Doctrine*, they muſt in order to ſuch a judgment be certain what that *Doctrine* is which they muſt judge of the *Church* by. 2. No *Church* can be known to be Infallible, unleſs it appear to be ſo by that *Doctrine* which they are to examine the Truth of the *Church* by, and therefore no *Church* can be known to be Infallible by the *Motives of Credibility.* 3. No *Church* ought to be relyed on as *Infallible*, which may be found guilty of any Errour by comparing it with the *Doctrine* which we are to try it by. Therefore you muſt firſt prove your *Church* not to have erred in any particular; for if ſhe hath, it is impoſſible ſhe ſhould be Infallible: And not think to prove that ſhe *hath not erred* becauſe *ſhe cannot*, that being the thing in queſtion, and muſt by your dealing with the *Greek Church* be judged by Particulars. 4. There muſt be a *certain Rule of Faith* ſuppoſed to have ſufficient *Authority* to decide *Controverſies* without any dependence upon the *Church.* For, the Matter to be judged is the *Church*; and if the *Scripture* may and muſt decide that, Why may it not as well all the reſt? 5. Every Man's *Reaſon* proceeding according to this *Rule of Faith* muſt be left his *Judge* in *Matters of Religion.* And whatever Inconveniencies you can imagine to attend upon this, they immediately and neceſſarily follow from your proceeding with the *Greek Church* by excluding her becauſe ſhe hath erred, which while we are in purſuit of a *Church* can be determined by nothing but every ones particular Reaſon. 6. Then *Fundamentals* do not depend upon the *Churches Declaration.* For you aſſert the *Greek Church* to err fundamentally, and that this may be made appear to one who is ſeeking after a *Church.* Suppoſe then I inquire, as the *Lady* did, after a *Church* whoſe judgment I muſt abſolutely depend on, and ſome mention the *Greek*, and others the *Roman Church:* You tell me, It cannot be the *Greek, for that hath erred fundamentally.* I inquire how you know, ſuppoſing her to err, that it is a fundamental Errour? Will you anſwer me, *becauſe the true Church hath declared it to be a fundamental Errour?* But that was it I was ſeeking for which that *Church* is, which may declare what Errours are fundamental and what not? If you tell me *It is yours*, I may ſoon tell you, You ſeem to have a greater kindneſs for your *Church* than *your ſelf*, and venture to ſpeak any thing for the ſake of it. Thus we ſee how

P. 21. Sect. 4.

ſee how finely you have betrayed your whole Cauſe in your firſt Onſet, by ſo rude an Attempt upon the *Greek Church.*

And truly it was much your Concernment, to load her as much as you can: For though ſhe now wants one of the great Marks of your *Church* (which yet you know not how long your *Church* may enjoy) *viz. outward Splendour and Bravery*, yet you cannot deny, but that *Church* was planted by the *Apoſtles*, enjoyed a continual *Succeſſion* from them, flouriſhed with a number of the *Fathers* exceeding that of yours, had more of the *Councils* of greateſt Credit in it, and, which is a Commendation ſtill to it, it retains more Purity under its Perſecutions, than your *Church* with all its *external Splendour. But ſhe hath erred concerning the Holy Ghoſt, and*
P. 5. n. 4. *therefore hath loſt it.* A ſevere Cenſure which his Lordſhip rebukes Mr. *Fiſher* for citing King *James* ſo boldly for: *But two ways it may be taken*, he adds. 1. *To loſe ſuch Aſſiſtance as preſerves from all Errour.* 2. Or
P. 25. n. 17. Sect. 5. elſe *from all fundamental Errour*, this therefore, his Lordſhip truly ſaith, *is an Error of the firſt ſort, and not of the latter.*

§. 6. Paſſing by therefore his Lordſhips Expreſſions of his Modeſty, which if an *Errour* is one *you* are like to be ſecured from; and his cautious Expreſſions concerning the *Greek Church* which he highly ſhewed his *Wiſdom* in, was to me to conſider how you prove the *Greek Church* guilty of fundamental Errour. You ſay, *You paſs by his trifling, and make way for Truth.* I wonder not to ſee you reflect on his Lordſhip for his *Modeſty*, conſidering how little of it you ſhew towards him; let us then *make way* too, but it is to ſee *you* and *Truth* Combat together. *It is to be conſidered*, ſay you, *that*
P. 6. n. 4. *now for many hundred years, the whole* Latine *Church hath decreed and believed it to be flat Hereſie in the* Greeks; *and they decreed the contrary to be an Hereſie in the* Latin *Church, and both together condemned the Opinion of the* Grecians *as Heretical in a General Council (in* Florentino) *how then bears it any ſhew of probability, what ſome few of yeſterday (forced to it by an impoſſibility of otherwiſe avoiding the ſtrength of Catholick Arguments againſt them) affirm, that the matter of this Controverſie was ſo ſmall and inconſiderable, that it is not ſufficient to produce an Hereſie on either ſide? Is not this to make all the Churches of* Chriſtendome *for many hundred years quite blind, and themſelves only clear and ſharp ſighted? Which ſwelling Preſumption what Spirit it argues, and whence it proceeds, all thoſe who have learn'd from St.* Auguſtin, *that Pride is the Mother of Hereſie, will eaſily collect.* I grant this Speech of St. *Auguſtin* to be true; only let it be added, that *Pride is likewiſe the Mother of making Hereſies*, as will appear in this preſent Controverſie; and whether we, who vindicate the *Greek Church* from *Hereſie*, or you who would find the *Bill* againſt her (to keep her from any Rivalſhip with your Church) be more guilty of *Pride* will be ſoon diſcovered; but ſure you believe us not only to be *Men of yeſterday*, but *to know nothing* who ſhould ſentence the *Greek Church* for *Hereſie* upon ſuch feeble Pretences as theſe are. I know not what *Preſumption* that can be, to ſay, Men may be too forward on both ſides in calling each other *Hereticks*, and it may be not ſo much their *Blindneſs*, as *Pride* and *Paſſion* which may make them do it. But if they will condemn that for *Hereſie*, which is not ſo made appear to be upon any evidence from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, they were not ſo blind in defining it, as we ſhould be in following their judgment without further examination. *But this was for many hundred years.* The more to blame they, for continuing in ſo raſh judgments ſo long, if it appear ſo. But it is well ſtill you tell us, that *as the* Latin *Church condemned the* Greek *for Hereſie, the* Greek *condemned the* Latin *for it too.* And ſo by your own rule the one

was

was as blind as the other. *But the* Latin *Church had the right to determine Hereſie, and the* Greek *had not.* This is the Queſtion, Which *Church* muſt be relyed on for Judgment? And if they mutually condemn each other, we muſt have a higher *Rule* to judge of both by. *But ſtill, It is not an Argument, that it is a Hereſie of one ſide or the other, becauſe each Party condemns the other of Hereſie?* Juſt as much, as if two Men fall out, and call each other *Knaves*, it muſt be granted, that if both be not, yet at leaſt the one of them is ſo. *Hereſie* being grown the *ſcolding word in Religion*; and no two Parties can differ, but they ſeek to faſten this Reproach on each other. If one ſhould bring greater Evidence than the other of his *Knavery*, he ought to be more accounted ſo. No otherwiſe can it be here; if ſufficient Proof be brought of Hereſie on the one ſide, and not the other, that Party may be looked on as more guilty: But ſtill remembring, that the more confident Affirmation, the Pretence to greater Honeſty and Power, be not taken for the only Evidences of it: As I doubt it will appear in our preſent Caſe. But ſtill ſuppoſe, that of two Men who have ſo Reproached each other, the one of them being fallen into Diſtreſs and Poverty, and not hoping for Relief but from the other Perſon, and he denying it, unleſs he be content by joynt-conſent to be proclaimed *Knave*, which he through his neceſſity yielding to, but aſſoon as that is over declaring on what account they agreed; Muſt this Man be more pitied for his Neceſſity, or condemned for his Knavery? Juſt ſuch I ſhall make it appear, that which you call condemning the *Grecians* as *Heretical* in a *General Council* at *Florence*, to have been, and no otherwiſe.

§. 7. But I come to a cloſer Examination of this Subject, to ſee with what Juſtice you charge the *Greek Church*, either with *Hereſie* or *Schiſm*; For both theſe you accuſe it of in this Chapter. Two things were the moſt in diſpute between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, the one was the *Doctrine* of the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from Father and Son*, the other was concerning the *Addition* of the *Filióque* to the *Creed*. And although the *Greeks* in their Debates at *Ferrara* would not meddle with the Doctrine, before the *Latins* could clear themſelves concerning the *Addition*, which they ſaid was the main cauſe of the *Conteſt* between them; yet I am content to follow your Method, and handle the other firſt. Your Diſcourſe concerning the firſt, conſiſts of two parts, Proofs and Anſwers; *Proofs* of their *Hereſie*, and *Anſwers* to his Lordſhip's *Arguments* againſt it. The Proofs are double, the one from *Authority*, the other from *Theological Reaſon*. Through every of theſe Particulars I ſhall follow you, and from them I doubt not to evince, that the *Greeks* are not guilty of the Faults you lay to their Charge.

We have already ſeen what your Proofs from Authority are; their condemning one another for *Hereticks*, and the *Greeks* being condemned by a *General Council*. If I can therefore prove that the *Greeks* Opinion was not accounted an *Hereſie* before the *Council* of *Florence*, and that it did not become a Hereſie by the *Council* of *Florence*, I ſhall ſufficiently diſcover the Weakneſs of your Arguments from Authority.

1. *That it was not accounted a Hereſie before the Council of* Florence; I mean not, that there were no hot-brain'd Perſons in all the time of the Difference, who did not brand the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*, but that it was never accounted a *Hereſie*, by any of thoſe whom your ſelves account the only competent Judges of *Hereſie*; and thoſe are either the *Fathers*, or *Popes*, or *Councils*: Which I prove in their order.

1. That it was not accounted Hereſie by the *Fathers*; which will be proved by theſe two things. 1. Becauſe it is very doubtful whether many of the *Fathers* did believe the Proceſſion of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Son* or no. 2. Becauſe thoſe who did believe it, did not condemn thoſe of *Hereſie* who did not.

1. That it is very doubtful whether many of them did believe the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son or no*; at leaſt, ſo far as to make it *an Article of Faith*; for 1. There are clear Teſtimonies that they make it unneceſſary to be believed. 2. The Teſtimonies which ſeem to ſay, That they did believe it, do not neceſſarily imply that they did.

1. *That there are clear Teſtimonies, that they did not account it a thing neceſſary to be believed:* Both becauſe they in Terms aſſerted the Nature of this *Proceſſion* to be *incomprehenſible*, and withal, did as clearly affirm the belief of that, which doth not imply this Proceſſion to be ſufficient for Salvation. 1. *They in Terms aſſert, that the Myſtery of this Proceſſion is incomprehenſible.* And can you, or any reaſonable Man, imagine they ſhould make the manner of that *Proceſſion* to be an Article of Faith, which they acknowledge to be abſolutely beyond our apprehenſion? I grant, Something ſuppoſed by them to be *incomprehenſible* is made an *Article* of *Faith*: But then it is not *that* which is ſuppoſed as *incomprehenſible* under that Notion, which is made ſo; but the *thing* it *ſelf* which may be *incomprehenſible*; yet being clearly revealed in *Scripture*, ought to be believed, notwithſtanding that Incomprehenſibility of it: As the *Myſtery* of the *Trinity* it ſelf, the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son*, the *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the *Father*, &c. But then I ſay, theſe things are ſuch, as are either declared by them to be expreſly revealed in *Scripture*, or neceſſarily conſequent from ſomething ſuppoſed to be ſo. As for inſtance, ſuppoſing the *Trinity* in *Unity* to be ſomething Divinely revealed, whatever is neceſſarily conſequent from that, and is neceſſary to be believed in order to that, though it be *incomprehenſible*, muſt be believed; as, Suppoſing theſe two things clear from *Scripture*, that there is but one true *God*, and that there are *three Perſons*, who have the Name, Properties, and Attributes of *God* given to them, though our Reaſon be too ſhort to fathom the manner how theſe can have three diſtinct *Subſiſtences*, and yet but one *Eſſence*, becauſe our Reaſon (*i. e.* all thoſe Conceptions which we have formed in our Mind from the obſervation of things) doth tell us, that *Thoſe things which agree or diſagree in a third, agree, or diſagree one with another*, and from thence it would infer, that, if the *Father* be *God*, and the *Son God*, there could be no difference between *Father* and *Son*; yet this being meerly as to the Connexion of two Propoſitions, both of which are ſuppoſed diſtinctly revealed in *Scripture*; we are bound in this caſe to believe ſuch a *Connexion*, becauſe both parts are equally revealed by an *Infallible Teſtimony*, though the *Mode* of that *Connexion* be to us *Incomprehenſible*: But it is not ſo, where neither clear Revelation, nor a neceſſary Conſequent from ſomething which is divinely revealed doth inforce our Belief of it. As in our preſent Caſe: Since we ſuppoſe it revealed in *Scripture*, that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt* are *God*, whatever is neceſſary to the belief of that, though *incomprehenſible*, we ought to believe it: But if there be ſomething without which I may believe the *Deity* of the *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*, and this not clearly aſſerted in *Scripture*, but is a thing in it ſelf incomprehenſible, that cannot be made a neceſſary Article of Faith: Thus that the *Spirit* doth proceed from the *Father*, *ſeems* neceſſary on both accounts, as conſequent upon the Belief of the *Trinity* in *Unity*, and as clearly expreſſed in *Scripture*:

pture: But that the *Spirit* ſhould proceed from *Father and Son* as from *one Principle*, that they ſhould Communicate in an Action proper to their *Subſiſtences*, and yet be diſtinguiſhed from each other in thoſe *Subſiſtences*, and agree only in *Eſſence*, (and if the *Spirit* proceeds not from their *Subſiſtences*, but from the *Eſſence*, the *Spirit* muſt proceed from it ſelf, becauſe that is common to all three;) theſe things being in themſelves *incomprehenſible*, and not neceſſary to the Belief of the *Divinity*, either of *Son* or *Holy Ghoſt*, nor pretended to be clearly revealed in *Scripture*, cannot be ſaid to make a neceſſary Article of Faith, the denyal of which muſt ſuppoſe *Hereſie*. And therefore that which is the only Objection in this caſe is removed, *viz.* that this *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the Father is incomprehenſible, and yet ſuppoſed to be an Article of *Faith*; for that I have already ſhewed is expreſly revealed in *Scripture*, that *the Spirit doth proceed from the Father.* But neither is the Proceſſion from the *Son* neceſſary to the Belief of the *Deity* of the *Son*; for if it were, it would be as neceſſary to the *Deity* of the *Holy Ghoſt* that the *Son* ſhould be begotten by the *Spirit*; neither doth it follow from any place of *Scripture*, for all thoſe places which are uſually brought are very capable of ſuch Interpretations, as do not at all infer it; from hence then it follows, that thoſe who upon theſe Terms acknowledge this Proceſſion incomprehenſible, do therein imply, that the belief of it is no Article neceſſary to Salvation, and therefore the denyal no Hereſie.

John 15. 26.

Now for this we have the cleareſt Teſtimonies of ſuch who were the greateſt and moſt zealous aſſertors of the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*. *Athanaſius* ſaith expreſly, *That it is ſufficient to know, that the Spirit is no Creature, nor to be reckoned among God's Works; for nothing of another nature is mingled with the Trinity, but it is undivided, and like it ſelf: Theſe things are ſufficient for Believers. But*, ſaith he, *when we come hither, the Cherubims veil their Faces; but he that inquires and ſearches into more than theſe, neglects him that hath ſaid, Be not wiſe overmuch*, &c. If it be ſufficient to know, that the *Spirit* is no *Creature*, it cannot be neceſſary to believe, that the *Spirit proceeds from the Son:* For they who do not believe that, do firmly believe the *Deity* of it. And if whatever goes beyond that, *goes beyond the bounds which God hath ſet us*, then certainly he never dreamt that Men ſhould be condemned for *Hereſie*, as to ſome things which cannot be ſuppoſed to be within them. To the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks St. *Baſil* in ſeveral places, acknowledging the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt to be a thing inexplicable*, and when the *Hereticks* enquired of him, *What kind of thing that Proceſſion was, when the Spirit was neither* ἀγέννητος, *nor yet* γεννητός, all the anſwer he gives them, is, *If there be ſuch multitudes of things in the World which we are ignorant of, what ſhame is it to confeſs our Ignorance here?* And if it be here our Duty to confeſs our Ignorance, it is far from it to be Magiſterial and Definitive, that unleſs Men acknowledge every *Punctilio*, they are guilty of Hereſie and fundamental Errors. St. *Gregory Nazianzen* mentioning

Ἀρχὴ γινώσκειν ὅτι μὴ κτίσμα ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, μηδὲ τοῖς ποιήμασι συναριθμᾶται, ἃ γὲ ἀλλότριον ἐπιμίγνυται τῇ Τριάδι, ἀλλ' ἀδιαίρετός ἐστι, καὶ ὁμοία ἑαυτῇ. Ἀρκεῖ ταῦτα τοῖς πιστοῖς. ἕως τούτων τὰ Χερουβὶμ καλύπτει τὰς πλέυρας· Ὁ δὲ περιτλὰ τούτων ζητῶν καὶ θέλων ἐρευνᾶν παρακούει τοῦ λέγοντος, μὴ σοφίζου πολλά, &c. *Athanaſ. ep. ad Serapion. p.* 357. *Tom.* 1.

Εἰ δὲ πολλὰ ἀγνοεῖς, καὶ μυριοπλάσια τῶν ἐγνωσμένων ὅτι τὰ ἀγνούμενα, τί ἀρχὴ μέλλει πάντων καὶ περὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὴν ἀκίνδυνον ἄγνοιαν ἀνεπαισχύντως ὁμολογεῖς; Basil. De Spir. Sanct. c. 18.

tioning that Queſtion, *What this Proceſſion is?* returns this Anſwer, *Tell me firſt what it is for the Father to be unbegotten, and I will explain the Generation of the Son, and Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; that we may both therein ſhew our Folly, who pry into theſe Divine Myſteries, and do not know the things which are before our Feet.* And elſewhere, *If we enquire into theſe things, what ſhall we leave to them, whom the Scripture tells us alone know and are known of each other?* St. *Cyril* requires of Men, *To believe his Being, and Subſiſtence, and Dominion over all; but for other things not to ſuffer the Mind to go beyond the Bounds allotted to humane Nature.* Theſe ſpoke like *wiſe Men*, and the true *Fathers* of the *Church*, who would have Men content themſelves with believing meerly what was neceſſary in theſe deep and incomprehenſible Myſteries, and not to make *Articles* of *Faith* of ſuch things which are not made neceſſary, either by deduction of Reaſon, or clear Divine *Revelation.* Although therefore I ſhould grant, that ſome, or all of theſe, did themſelves believe this *Proceſſion* from the *Son*, yet hereby it appears they were far from impoſing it upon others, or making it a *Hereſie* in any not to believe it. They ſaw well theſe were not things to be narrowly ſearched into, but as the *Philoſopher* ſaid of ſome kind of *Hellebore*, *taken in the lump it is Medicinal, but beaten into Powder is dangerous*, is true of theſe more abſtruſe Myſteries of Religion; for whoſoever will endeavour to ſatisfie himſelf concerning them from the ſtrange Niceties and Subtilties of the *Schools*, may return with greater Doubts than he went to them. For not to go beyond our preſent Subject, whoſoever would examine the way they take to make the *Proceſſion* to be immediate from the *Father* and the *Son*, ſo as to be from one Principle, to ſhew how the *Spirit* comes from both by the ſame numerical *Spiration*; but moſt all, when they come to make Diſtinctions between the *Generation* of the *Son*, and the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, (of which no leſs than nine are recounted and rejected by *Petavius*, out of the *Fathers* and *Schoolmen*, and the laſt which he reſts in, which is the common one of the *Schools*, *viz.* That the one is *per modum Intellectûs*, and the other *per modum Amoris*, as unſatisfactory as any, there being ſo vaſt a diſproportion between the moſt immediate Acts of our Souls and theſe Emanations) will ſee much greater Reaſon to commend the Wiſdom of thoſe Fathers, who ſought to repreſs Mens Curioſity as to theſe things, and as much to condemn you, who are ſo apt to charge whole *Churches* with Hereſie, if they come not up to every thing which you ſhall pronounce to be an *Article of Faith.*

Τίς ἓν ἡ ἐκπόρευσις; εἰπὲ σὺ τὸν ἀγέννητον εἶναι τὸν πατέρα, κἀγὼ τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ υἱοῦ φυσιολογήσω, καὶ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ παραπλησίσομεν ἀμφω εἰς θεῖα μυστήρια παρακύπτοντες. καὶ ταῦτα τίνες, οἱ μηδὲ τὰ ἐν ποσὶν εἰδέναι δυνάμενοι, &c. *Greg. Nazian. orat.* 37. *p.* 597. *Tom.* 1.

Εἰ δὲ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιζητεῖς τὶ καλαλείψεις τοῖς μόνοις γινώσκειν ἀλλήλα καὶ γινώσκεσθαι ὑπ' ἀλλήλων μαρτυρομένοις. Orat. 23. Tom. 1. p. 426.

Ὅτι μὲν ἔστι καὶ ὑπάρχει καὶ τῶν ὅλων κράτει συναινῶν τε καὶ συνηδόμενος. ἐπίκεινα δὲ ὥσπερ τῶν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος μέτρων ἓνα τὸν ἴδιον σωφρόνως ἐφιείς. Cyril. Paſchal. 12. Tom. 5. p. 2.

Dogm. Theol. de Trinit. l. 7. c. 13, 14. Tom. 2.

§. 8. 2. It is plain from the Fathers, *That they made the belief of that to be ſufficient for Salvation, which doth not imply this Proceſſion from the Son*; which is, that the *Holy Ghoſt* doth proceed from the *Father*: If therefore they often mention the *Proceſſion from the Father*, without taking notice of the *Proceſſion from the Son*, and when they do ſo, aſſert the ſufficiency of the Belief of that for Salvation; there cannot be the leaſt ground to imagine that they looked on the Proceſſion from the *Son* as a neceſſary Article of Faith. We ſee before, *Athanaſius* made no more neceſſary, than

than the Belief of the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and in the ſame Diſcourſe, where he ſpeaks expreſly what the Orthodox Opinion was of the *Holy Ghoſt*, he ſays no more, but, *If they thought well of the Word, they would likewiſe of the Spirit, which proceeds from the Father, and is proper to the Son, and is given by him to the Diſciples, and all that believe on him.* In which words there is nothing but what the *Greeks* to this day do moſt freely and heartily acknowledge, *viz. That the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Son,* being given by him to all that believe. Many other Teſtimonies are produced out of him and the reſt of the *Greek Fathers*, by the *Patriarch Hieremias* in his Anſwer to the *Wirtenberg Divines*, by *Marcus Epheſius* in his Diſputes in the *Council* of *Florence*, by *Gregorius Palamas* in his Anſwer to *Beccus* the *Latinizing Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Michael Palæologus*, and other modern Defendants of the *Greek Church*. But although I do not think, that the places produced by them are ſufficient for their purpoſe, *viz. That thoſe Fathers believed the Proceſſion from the Father, excluſivè*, to be an Article of Faith; yet whoſoever will take the pains to compare theſe Teſtimonies with the others produced on the other ſide by thoſe who writ in defence of the *Filioque*, either *Latins*, as *Hugo Eterianus*, *Anſelme*, &c. or *Latinizing Greeks*, ſuch as *Nicephorus Blemmydes*, *Beccus*, *Emanuel Calecas*, and others, will find it moſt for the honour of the Fathers, and moſt conſonant to Truth, to aſſert that they did not look upon this as any neceſſary Article of Faith, and therefore took liberty to expreſs themſelves differently about it as they ſaw occaſion. For ſuch different Teſtimonies are produced, not only of different *Fathers*, but of ſeveral *places* of the ſame, that it will be a hard matter, but upon this Ground to reconcile them to each other and themſelves: And that which abundantly confirms it, is, That when they ſate moſt ſolemnly in *Council* to determine the Matters of Faith about the *Trinity*, they were ſo far from inſerting this, when they had juſt occaſion to do it, that they only mention the Proceeding from the *Father*, and determine this to be a perfect *Symbol* of *Chriſtian Faith* which contained no more. In the *firſt* Nicene *Creed*, and that which is properly ſo called, (for that which now goes under that Name is the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed*) there was nothing at all determined concerning the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*; and yet *Athanaſius* ſaith expreſly of the Faith there delivered by the Fathers according to the Scriptures, *That it was of it ſelf ſufficient for the turning Men from all Impiety, and the Eſtabliſhment of all Chriſtian Piety.* And afterwards ſaith, That *though certain Men contended much for ſome Additions to be made to it, yet the* Sardican *Synod would by no means conſent to it, becauſe the Nicene Creed was not defective, but ſufficient for Piety, and therefore forbid the making of any new Creed, leſt the former ſhould be accounted defective.* We ſee then by the Teſtimony of *Athanaſius* and the *Sardican Synod*, (which when it ſerves your turn, as in the Caſe of Appeals, you extol ſo much, and in defence of *Zoſimus* his Forgery of the *Nicene Canons*, you would have confounded with the

Εἰ γὰρ ἐφρόνουν ὀρθῶς περὶ τοῦ λόγου, ἐφρόνουν ἂν ὑγιῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· ὁ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἴδιον ὄν, παρ' αὐτοῦ μεταδίδοται τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτόν. Athanaſ. c. Serap. ubi ſupr.

Acta Theolog. Wirtenberg. p. 217. &c.
Reſ. 2. Patriarch.
Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 19, 20, 21, &c.
Arcudii opuſcula aurea.
V. ep. Cyrilli Patriarch. ad Joh. Utenbogard. inter epiſtol. Remonſtrant. p. 402.

V. Leonis Allatii Græciam Orthodox. Tom. 2.

Ἡ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πίστις τῶν παλαιῶν καλὰ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ὁμολογηθεῖσα πίστις, αὐτάρκης ὅτι πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν μὲν πάσης ἀσεβείας, σύσασιν δὲ εὐσεβείας, ἐν Χριστῷ. Athanaſ. ep. ad Epictet. Tom. 1. p. 562.

the *Nicene*) that the *Nicene Creed* without any thing at all concerning the *Procession of the Holy Ghost* was looked on as sufficient to Salvation, and therefore certainly they did not then judge this Article of the *Procession* to be so necessary as you would have it be. But suppose we yield *Nazianzen*, and the *Fathers* of the *Constantinopolitan Council*, that though this *Creed* was not defective as to the *Son*, yet there ought to be somewhat added further concerning the *Holy Ghost*, upon the rising of *Macedonius*: Yet even here we shall find when they purposely added to the Article of the *Holy Ghost*, they added only this touching the *Procession* τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, *which proceedeth from the Father.* And thus the Copies of the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, either in the *Councils*, or elsewhere have it, where they mention the Procession at all; And when *Marcus Ephesius* in the *Florentine Council* read this *Creed*, the *Latins* took no Exceptions at all to it, but it passed then as it doth still for the *Nicene Creed*, (although it much differs from the Original *Nicene*) and therefore it is a great Mistake of them, who imagine the Article of *Filioque* was found in some Copies of this *Creed*, for this the *Latins* never pretended in the *Florentine Council*, (but did indeed as to the *Creed* of the second *Council* of *Nice*, but were therein much suspected of Forgery by the *Greeks*) which might be the Ground of that Mistake. But that which I insist on, is, If this Article of the Procession of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son* had been by these *Fathers* judged necessary, when had there been a fitter time to insert it than now, when purposely they added the Procession to the former Creed? And yet we see they did not judge it at all necessary to be inserted. It may be you will say, it was, *Because the Controversie was not then started concerning the Filioque*; But that can signifie nothing here, because we have already shewed that the *Fathers* themselves spake differently concerning it, and looked upon it as a thing not necessary to be known; but the things which were upon the rising of *Hereticks* inserted into the *Creed*, were such as by the *Fathers* were judged and believed as necessary before ever those Hereticks arose; as in the Case here of *Macedonius*, for I hope you will not say it was no Heresie to deny the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*, till it was determined in this *Oecumenical Council?* For the *Fathers* never thought that they made Articles of Faith in *Councils*, but only declared themselves, and what they believed against the Hereticks which did arise in the *Church*: And therefore that Answer of the *Filioque* not being then controverted, comes to nothing. From hence we come to the third *Oecumenical Council*, to see if that adds any thing concerning this *Procession*; instead of which it highly confirms what was established before; for the *Fathers* of that *Council* discerning at last the great Inconveniency of making such Additions to the *Creed*, because the *Nestorians* had got the Art of it too, and made a new *Creed* of their own, (which by *Charisius* was brought to the Council and there read) upon which the *Ephesine Fathers* make an irrevocable Decree *against all Additions being made hereafter to the Creed*. For after they had caused the *Nicene*, or rather the *Constantinopolitan Creed* to be publickly read (in which yet the Article of Procession was left out, as appears by that Copy which *Marcus Ephesius* produced at the *Council of Ferrara*, as it is likewise in the Copies of the *Ephesine Council*) upon which they pass this definitive Sentence; *That it should not be lawful hereafter for any one to produce, write, or compose any other Creed, besides*

Greg. Nazian. Ep. 2. ad Cled.

Concil. Ephes. Part. 2. Act. 6. p. 357. Tom. 2. Binii ed. Par. 1636. Concil. Florent. sess. 5. p. 587.

Μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἤγουν συγγράφειν, ἢ συντιθέναι ἑτέραν πίστιν, παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συναχθέντων ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. Concil. Eph. Part. 2. Act. 6. p. 366.

that

that which was agreed on and designed by the Holy Fathers, who were met together at Nice *by the Holy Spirit.* Concerning the meaning of this Decree, we shall fully enquire when we come to the addition of the *Filioque.* That which I take notice of it now for, is, not only the further Ratification of what was in the *Creed* before, and that what was therein contained was as much as was judged necessary, but an express Decree made against all after-additions; which doth, as fully as a *General Council* could do, declare that nothing else was necessary to be believed, but what was already inserted in the Creed: Or else, To what end did they prohibit any further Additions? To the like purpose, the fourth *General Council* of *Chalcedon* determines, *That by no means they would suffer that Faith to be moved which was already defined.* I might proceed to the fifth and sixth *Councils*, but these are sufficient. Let me now put some few *Questions* to you: Are General Councils Infallible, or no? *Yes*, say you, *if confirmed by the Pope.* Were not these four first Councils confirmed? *Yes, it is evident they were.* Were they then Infallible in all their Decrees or no, especially concerning Matters of Faith? If they were, were they not Infallible in this Determination, That it should not be lawful to add to the *Creed* any thing else but what was in before? Were they Infallible in declaring the received *Creed* to be full and sufficient? If they were so, how comes any Article to become necessary, which was not then in the *Creed?* If you say, The *Pope* and another *General Council* have Power Infallibly to contradict these, and to say that somewhat else is necessary to be inserted into the *Creed*, and to be believed in order to Salvation; I must content my self with having brought you to the humble Confession, that both parts of a Contradiction may be infallibly determined. Thus we see that the *Fathers*, whether single or joyned, in such *Councils* which are of the greatest Authority in the Christian World, have been so far from believing or determining this Article of the *Procession of the Holy Ghost* to be necessary, (which must be, if the denial of it be a fundamental Error) that they have plainly enough expressed and determined the contrary.

Κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον σαλεύεσθαι πρός τινων ἀνεχόμεθα τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν πίστιν. Concil. Chalced. Act. 5. Concil. Florent. Ass. 5. p. 590.

2. The next thing we come to, is, *That those Testimonies which are produced out of the Fathers, are so far from asserting the Necessity of this Article, that the most of them do not evidently prove that they believed it.* For these two Answers the *Greeks* return to them. 1. That they do not assert the Procession of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but the *Consubstantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son.* 2. That those which speak of a *Procession*, do not mean it of an *Eternal Procession*, but a *Temporal*, which is the same with the *Spirits Mission.* §. 9.

1. That they do not assert the *Eternal Procession* of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but the *Consubstantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son.* And therefore no more can be inferred from them, but only the ὁμοούσιον which the *Greeks* constantly acknowledge. This they make probable by two things: 1. That, when the *Fathers* dispute with those who denied the *Consubstantiality* of *Son* and *Spirit*, they use not the Particle *ex*, but only say that the *Spirit* is the *Spirit* of the *Son.* So *Cyril* expresly, when *Theodoret* had denied the Procession from the Son, he

he gives no other Anſwer, but this, *The Holy Spirit doth truly proceed from God and the Father, according to our Savour's words, but is not of another Nature from the Son.* We ſee he contents himſelf with the acknowledgment that the Spirit is of the ſame Nature with the Son: To the ſame purpoſe is another Teſtimony of his produced by the *Patriarch Hieremias*; ſpeaking of the *Spirit* whereby the Apoſtles ſpake, he ſays, *Which proceeded in an ineffable manner from the Father, but is not different from the Son in regard of his Eſſence.* Several other Teſtimonies are there produced by him, and elſewhere by others, which need not be here recited. 2. That when they uſe the Particle *ex*, it is againſt thoſe who denied the *Conſubſtantiality* both of the *Son* and *Spirit*; and therefore *Gregorius Palamas* lays down this Rule, *That, as often as the Præpoſitions*, ex *and* per, *have the ſame force in Divinity; they do not denote any diviſion or difference in the Trinity, but only their Conjunction and inſeparable Union, and conſent of their Wills.* For which, he cites the famous Epiſtle of *Maximus* to *Marinus*, which was made the Foundation of the *Union* at the *Council* of *Florence*, who therein ſaith, that when the *Latins* ſaid in their *Synodical Epiſtle*, ſent to *Conſtantinople*, that the *Spirit* did proceed *ex filio*, they meant no more than to ſhew τὸ συναφὲς τῆς ἐσίας καὶ ἀπαρράλλακτον, *the perfect and inſeparable Union of the Divine Eſſence.* So when St. *Baſil* ſaith, that the *Father did Create the World, per filium*; he adds, that notes no more than τὸ ἡνωμένον τῆ θελήσει, *the Conjunction of their Wills.* And by this means the *Greeks* interpret all thoſe Paſſages of the *Fathers*, which ſeem moſt expreſs for the *Spirits proceeding ex filio.* So *Marcus Epheſius* tells the *Latins* in the *Florentine Council*, that when we ſay, Man comes ἐκ τῆς ἐσίας, *from the Eſſence of a Man*, therein is not implied, that the Eſſence of Man is the productive cauſe of Man, but only it notes the τὸ ὁμοούσιον, *that Communion of Eſſence* which is in Men; ſo, when the *Greek Fathers* ſpeak of the *Spirit's proceeding ex Filio*, that doth not imply that the *Son* is the Principle of *Spiration*, but that there is a *Communion of Eſſence* between the *Son* and the *Spirit.* So, when *Athanaſius* diſputing againſt the *Arians* (ſaith the Patriarch *Hieremias*) ſaith, that the Spirit ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ *from the Son, is given to all*; and *that the Father* διὰ τοῦ λόγου, ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *by the Son, in the Spirit, doth create, work, and give all things*; you muſt conſider, that *Athanaſius* was then diſputing againſt the *Arians*, who made both *Son* and *Spirit* to be *Creatures:* That therefore he might ſhew that the *Spirit* was of the ſame *Subſtance* with the *Father* and the *Son*; he therefore uſeth that Prepoſition *ex*, ἐγκαίρως καὶ ἁρμοδίως *very opportunely and conveniently.* Therefore, ſaith he, *It is to be obſerved, that he never uſeth this but in oppoſition to the* Arians, *and ſuch who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt.* To which purpoſe it is well obſerved by *Spalatenſis*, that when the *Fathers* of the *Conſtantinopolitan Council* did inſert into their *Creed* the Article of the *Spirits Proceſſion* from the *Father*; they did it not with a purpoſe to define any thing concerning the *Proceſſion* as an Article of *Faith*, but that they might from thoſe words of St. *John* infer the *Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt*, becauſe it proceeds from the *Father:* And withal, it

Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, κατὰ τὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος φωνὴν, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἀλλοτρίου ἐστὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. Cyril. Alexan. Tom. 6. edit. Pariſ. p. 229.

Ὃ προῆσι μὲν ἀῤῥήτως ἐκ τοῦ παλεῖς. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀλλότριον, κατὰ τὸ τῆς οὐσίας λόγον. Acta Theolog. Wittenberg. Reſp. 2. Patriarch p. 202.

Gregorius Palamas, c. 1. apud Petavium Dogmat. Theolog. de Trin. To. 2. l. 7. c. 18. ἐ τὸ διαίρειν, οὐδὲ τὸ διαφορὰν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἕνωσιν, καὶ τὸ ἀδιαλλαξίαν —— καὶ τὸ ὁμοθελίαν.

Seſſ. 19.

Ubi ſupra.

Spalatenſ. de Rep. Eccleſ. Tom. 3. l. 7. c. 10. Sect. 125.

is further obſervable, that in the *Creed*, which *Chariſius* delivered in to, and was accepted by the *Council* of *Epheſus*, all that he ſays as to the *Holy Ghoſt*, is, *And in the Spirit of Truth, the Paraclet, who is Conſubſtantial with the Father and the Son.* By which, that which *Spalatenſis* ſaith is much confirmed; for this Symbol of *Chariſius* was accepted by the *Council* as agreeable to the *Nicene Creed.* Thus we ſee, how probable this Anſwer of the *Greeks* is, That the Intention of the *Fathers* in thoſe Expreſſions is only to aſſert the *Conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Father* and the *Son*, becauſe when they uſed them it was in their Diſputes with them who denied it. And therefore *Petavius* ſpends his pains to very little purpoſe, when going about to take off this Anſwer of the *Greeks*, he only ſhews that thoſe Expreſſions *in themſelves* cannot be confined meerly to the ſignification of the *Conſubſtantiality* of the Perſons, whereas the main force of this anſwer lies in the intention and ſcope of the Perſons who uſed them, and the Adverſaries they diſputed againſt, and not in the importance of the Articles themſelves.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τ ἀληθείας, τὸ παράκλητον ὁμοούσιον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ. Apud Acta Concil. Epheſ. part. 2. Act. 6. p. 360.

Petav. ubi ſupra.

2. The ſecond Anſwer of the *Greeks*, is, that moſt of thoſe places which ſpeak of the Proceſſion of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, are not to be underſtood of the *Eternal Proceſſion*, but of the *Temporal*, which is the ſame with the *Spirit's Miſſion.* This, as the reſt of the *Greeks*, ſo the *Patriarchs Hieremias* and *Cyril* eſpecially inſiſt upon; the firſt in his laſt Anſwer to the *Divines* of *Wirtenberg.* For when they in their Reply to his ſecond Anſwer, had produced ſeveral Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, *Cyril*, *Epiphanius*, *Baſil*, and *Nazianzen*, in behalf of the *Spirits Proceſſion* from the *Son*; he wonders at them, that having the plain and clear places both of *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which do (as he ſaith) ſo openly proclaim the *Spirit's Proceſſion from the Father only*, they ſhould hope for relief from other obſcure places, which are capable of a different interpretation. As from the word φαίνει, which only relates to the *Spirit's Manifeſtation*, and is quite different from the ἐκπόρευσις, and ſo cannot imply his Eternal Proceſſion. Therefore for the clearing the Controverſie, and giving account of the Miſtakes in it, he begins with the Signification of the *Spirit*, which when it is applied to the *Divine Spirit*, is capable of different Significations, being taken either for the ſeveral Gifts of the Spirit, or for the Perſon of the Spirit; and ſo, though the word Proceſſion be taken in a peculiar manner for the Eternal Proceſſion of the Spirit, yet it is not only ſometimes attributed to the beſtowing the forementioned Gifts, but likewiſe to the Eternal *Generation* of the *Son*; and therefore whenever they meet with the word Proceſſion attributed to the Spirit with a reſpect to the *Son*, they muſt not preſently infer the Eternal Proceſſion, but the word ἐκπορεύεσθαι there ſignifies no more than διέναι, πέμπεσθαι, καὶ δίδοσθαι, *i. e.* that the *Spirit doth come through, is ſent, and given by the Son*, which the *Fathers* often mention, the better thereby to aſſert τὴν συμφυΐαν καὶ γνησιότητα τῦ πνεύματος, *the Indentity of Nature and Eſſence, which is in the Spirit with the Father and Son.* This he doth therein very largely explain, and endeavour to make it out, that this is the moſt proper Interpretation both of Scripture and Fathers, when they ſeem moſt clearly to ſpeak of the Proceſſion of the *Spirit* from the *Son.* The ſame likewiſe the *Patriarch Cyril* inſiſts upon, who acknowledgeth theſe ſeveral words to be attributed to the *Spirit* in reference to the *Son* δίδοσθαι, πεμπεσθαι, ἐκχεῖσθαι, ἐκφυσᾶσθαι, φαίνειν, and ſeveral others in the writings of the *Fathers*, all which he acknowledgeth to be true, but he denies that any of them do import a *Hypoſtatical Proceſſion* of

Acta Theolog. Wirtenb. p. 350. &c. Reſp. 3. Patriarch.

Cyril. ep. ad Utenbogard. p. 403.

the *Spirit* from the *Son*, but that they all refer to the temporal Miſſion and Manifeſtation of the *Spirit* through *Chriſt*, under the *Goſpel*. Whether this Anſwer will reach to all the places produced out of the *Fathers*, is not here my buſineſs to enquire, only that which is pertinent to my Purpoſe may be ſufficiently inferred from hence, that the *Fathers* certainly were not *Definitive* in this *Controverſie*, when their expreſſeſt Sentences ſeem capable of quite a different meaning to Wiſe and Learned Men, who, one would think, if the Belief of this Proceſſion had been a Tradition of their Church, or fully expreſſed in the Writings of the *Fathers* of the *Greek Church*, could not be ſo ignorant or wilful, as either not to ſee this to have been their meaning, or ſuppoſing they had ſeen it, to perſiſt in ſo obſtinate a belief of the contrary. I can therefore with advantage return your words back again to you. *It is to be conſidered, that for many hundred Years the whole* Greek *Church never believed this to be an Article of Faith; nay, the Fathers were ſo far from it, that both ſingle and in General Councils they did plainly expreſs the contrary; how then bears it any ſhew of probability, what ſome few of yeſterday (forced to it by an impoſſibility of otherwiſe defending the Power and Infallibility of the* Roman *Church) affirm, that the Matter of this Controverſie is ſo great and conſiderable, that it is ſufficient to produce an Hereſie on either ſide? Is not this to make Fathers, and General Councils, and conſequently all* Chriſtendome *for many hundred Years, quite blind, and themſelves only clear and ſharp-ſighted? Which ſwelling Preſumption, what Spirit it argues, and whence it proceeds, all thoſe who have learnt from Reaſon, if not from St.* Auguſtine, *That Pride is the Mother of making Hereſies in unneceſſary Articles of Faith, will eaſily collect.* Do not you ſee now, how unadviſedly thoſe words came from you, which with ſo ſmall variation in the manner of expreſſion, and much greater truth in the matter of it, are returned upon your ſelf?

5. 10. But I go on ſtill, if poſſible, to make you ſenſible, how much you have wronged the *Greek Church* in this charge of a fundamental Error in her for denying the *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* from the *Son*. Which ſhall be from hence, that although there were ſome who did as plainly deny this as ever the *Modern* Greeks *did or do*, yet they were far from being condemned for *Hereſie* in ſo doing. For which we muſt conſider, that although the *Fathers*, as we have already ſeen, did ſpeak ambiguouſly in this matter, yet the firſt who appears openly and ſtoutly to have denied it, was *Theodoret*; which, being the riſe of the *Controverſie*, muſt be more carefully enquired into. It appears then, that a *General Council* being ſummoned by the *Emperour Theodoſius* to meet at *Epheſus* concerning the Opinions of *Neſtorius*, which were vehemently oppoſed by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and ſeveral *Ægyptian* and *Aſian Biſhops*, who being there convened, proceeded to the *depoſition* of *Neſtorius* and *Anathematizing* his Doctrine, before *Johannes Antiochenus*, and ſeveral other *Biſhops* who favoured *Neſtorius*, were come to *Epheſus*. When theſe therefore came and found what had been done by the other *Biſhops*, they being ſeconded by *Candidianus* there, and the *Court-party* at *Conſtantinople*, aſſemble apart by themſelves, and proceed on the other ſide to a Depoſition and Excommunication of *Cyril* and *Memnon*, who were the leaders of all the reſt; and theſe make an *Anti-Synod* to the other, which conſiſted of Perſons of ſeveral Intereſts and Perſwaſions, ſome *Pelagains*, ſome *Neſtorians*, and others, more as *Friends* to *Neſtorius* than his Opinions, as being his *ancient Familiars* and Acquaintance, did joyn with them to prevent his Depoſition; among which, the chief were *Johannes Antiochenus*, and *Theodoret*. But before the *Council*, *Cyril* had publiſhed his twelve *Anathema's* againſt the Opinions of *Neſtorius*: To theſe therefore, not only the *Oriental Biſhops* gave an anſwer, but *John* the *Patri-*

arch

arch of *Antioch* particularly appoints *Theodoret* to refute them. The *ninth Anathema* of *Cyril* was againſt *Neſtorius*, and all others who ſaid, *That Chriſt uſed the Holy Ghoſt as a diſtinct Power from himſelf, for the working of Miracles, and that did not acknowledge him to be the proper Spirit of Chriſt.* *Theodoret* grants the firſt part, wherein he ſhews he was no *Neſtorian*, but quarrels with the latter part; for, ſaith he, *If by that he means that the Spirit is of the ſame nature with the Son, and that it proceeds from the Father, we acknowledge it together with him——but if by that he underſtands as though the Spirit had his ſubſiſtence from or by the Son, we reject it as Blaſphemous and Impious.* Was ever any thing in this kind ſpoken with greater heat and confidence than this was here by *Theodoret?* And if this had been looked on as *Heretical* at that time, can we poſſibly imagine that ſo zealous an Oppoſer of all Hereſies, and eſpecially of the *Neſtorians*, as St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was, ſhould ſo coolly and patiently paſs this by as he doth? For all the anſwer he gives, is only that which was before cited out of him; that he acknowledgeth, *The Spirit doth proceed from the Father, but yet* ἐκ ἑτερότητον ὄντα τοῦ υἱοῦ, *it is not of another Nature from the Son*; but did not *Theodoret* expreſly aſſert that, as well as *Cyril?* Is it then poſſible that any one who hath his Wits about him, ſhould imagine, that if that Doctrine of *Theodoret* had been accounted *Heretical*, it being expreſſed in ſo vehement a manner as it is, it ſhould have no other anſwer from *Cyril*, but only approving that which *Theodoret* confeſſeth, *viz. the Conſubſtantiality of the Spirit with the Son?* All the Anſwer which *Petavius* and others give, is ſo weak and trifling, that one may eaſily ſee how much they were put to it to find out any: Sometimes it was becauſe *Cyril* was intent upon his Buſineſs, and therefore paſſed it by; as though he were ſo weak a Man as to let his Adverſary broach Hereſie, and ſay nothing to it, becauſe it was not pertinent to the preſent Cauſe. But if it were not, it is an Argument the ſecond *Anſwer* is falſe, *viz.* that *Theodoret* was herein a *Neſtorian*; for if he were ſo, it could not be beſides the buſineſs, but was a main part of it. Moreover, if this were a piece of *Neſtorianiſm*, it is very ſtrange the *Fathers* of that *Council*, when they purpoſely collected the Opinions of *Neſtorius* out of his own Writings, ſhould never make any mention at all of this, no not when they produce his Opinion concerning the *Spirit of God.* Why was it not then condemned and *Anathematized* as one of his Hereſies? Why did not the *Oriental Biſhops*, when they ſubſcribed to the Depoſition of *Neſtorius*, and the Election of *Maximianus* at *Conſtantinople*, and ſent a Confeſſion of their Faith to *Cyril* at *Alexandria* by *Paulus Emeſenus*, mention this among the reſt of their Agreement with the Orthodox *Biſhops?* Yet in that extant both in *Cyril*'s Works, and in the third part of the Council at *Epheſus*, there is not the leaſt intimation of it. And therefore the learned *Jeſuit Sirmondus*, in the Life of *Theodoret*, prefixed by him to the firſt *Tome* of his Works which he ſet forth, vindicates *Theodoret* from all ſuſpicion of *Neſtorianiſm*, and imputes all the Troubles which he fell into on that account to the violence of *Dioſcorus* the Succeſſor of *Cyril* at *Alexandria*, who being a great Patron of the *Eutychians*, thought to revenge himſelf on *Theodoret*, by blaſting his Reputation as a *Neſtorian.* There is not then any ſhew of probability that this Opinion in *Theodoret* was condemned as a piece of *Neſtorianiſm*, which certainly the whole *Greek Church* could not have been

Ἴδιον δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ, εἰ μὲν ὡς ὁμοφυὲς καὶ Παλεῖος ἐκπορευόμενον ἔφη, συνομολογήσομεν,—εἰ δὲ ὡς ἐξ υἱοῦ ἢ δι' υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον, ὡς βλάσφημον τοῦτο, καὶ ὡς δυσσεβὲς ἀποῤῥίψομεν. Theodoret c. Cyril. Anath. Tom. 4. p. 718. ed. Sirmond. Concil. Epheſ. part. 3. p. 497. ed. Bin.

Cyril. Tom. 6. p. 229.

Dogmat. Theol Tom. 2. l. 7. c. 18.

c. 1.

Concil. Epheſ. Part. 2. Act. 1. p. 177.

Part. 3. p. 595.

ignorant of, from that time to this. But though that piece of *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*'s *Anathema's* were condemned in ſucceeding *Councils*, yet that might be for the defence of other things, which they judged bordered too near on *Neſtorianiſm*, or becauſe they would not have any Monument remain of that Diſcord between the *Oriental Biſhops*, and the *Epheſine Council*; which *Theodoſius* doth ſo much, and ſo heartily lament in his excellent Epiſtle to *Johannes Antiochenus* about a Reconciliation between him and *Cyril*, after the Baniſhment of *Neſtorius*, and the choice of *Maximianus*. Thus we ſee one who in a divided and buſie time ventured upon the abſolute denial of the Proceſſion of the *Holy Ghoſt* from the *Son* not as a bare Error, but as *Impious and Blaſphemous*, yet was far from being condemned for Heretical himſelf for ſaying ſo, by thoſe *Fathers*, who were the moſt zealous defenders of the true *Apoſtolical Faith*. And if theſe things conſidered together, do not make it appear that the *Fathers* did not make the denial of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son to be a Hereſie, I know not what can be made plain from them.

Part. 3. *p.* 581.

§. 11. But I know, whatever the *Fathers* ſay, you are of *Cornelius Muſſus* his mind, who heartily profeſſed, *that he preferred the judgment of one Pope, before a thouſand Auguſtines* and *Hieroms*; but what if the *Pope* ſhould prove of the ſame mind with the *Fathers*, how then can this be accounted an Hereſie? And that they were exactly of the ſame mind, might be made appear by the ſeveral Epiſtles of *Vigilius* and *Agatho*, in confirmation of the Faith eſtabliſhed in the *four firſt General Councils*, in which it was determined, that all neceſſaries were already in the *Creed*, and that there needed no further Additions to it, both which are produced and inſiſted on by the *Greeks* in the fifth *Seſſion* at *Ferrara*. But I paſs by them, and come to more particular Teſtimonies of *Popes*, and that either in *Councils*, or upon a Reference to them from *Councils*. The firſt time we read of this Controverſie in the *Weſtern Churches* was about *Anno Dom.* 767. in the time of *Conſtantius Copronymus*, upon which in the time of *Pepin* King of *France*, there was a *Synod* held at *Gentilly* near *Paris* for determining a *Controverſie* between the *Greeks* and *Latins* about the *Trinity*, as appears by the ſeveral Teſtimonies of *Ado* and *Rhegino* in their *Chronicles*, produced by *Pithœus*, *Petavius*, and others: But little more is left of that Convention, beſides the bare mention of it; but it ſeems the Aſhes were only raked over theſe Coals then, which about two and forty Years after, *Anno Dom.* 809. broke out into a greater *Flame*; for as appears by the *Teſtimonies* of the ſame *Ado*, and *Adelmus* or *Ademarus*, a Synod was held at *Aquiſgrane*, about this very Queſtion, *Whether the Spirit did proceed from the Son as well as the Father*; which Queſtion, they ſay, was ſtarted by one *John* a *Monk* of *Jeruſalem*, which *Monk Pithœus* ſuppoſeth to be *Johannes Damaſcenus*, who after *Theodoret* moſt expreſly denied *the Proceſſion from the Son*; but whether it was he or any other, it ſeems from that *Council* called by *Charles* the *Great*, there were ſeveral *Legates* (called *Apocriſiarii*) diſpatched to *Rome* to know the judgment of the preſent *Pope Leo* 3. concerning this Controverſie; the *Legates* were *Bernarius*, *Jeſſe*, and *Adalhardus*, the two former the *Biſhops* of *Worms* and *Amiens*, the latter the *Abbot* of *Corbey*. But *Petavius* herein betrays either his *Fraud* or *Inadvertency*, that he will by no means admit that theſe came to the *Pope* to know his judgment concerning the *Proceſſion it ſelf*, but only concerning the *Addition* of the *Filioque* to the *Creed*, which now began to be uſed in the *Gallican Churches* with that *Addition*. But although I grant that the main of their Buſineſs was concerning the *Addition* of *Filioque*, by the ſame token

Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 5. *p.* 593.

Pithœus Opuſ. de proceſ. S. S. p. 26.

Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. 2. *l.* 7. *c.* 1.

token that *Leo* condemned it, as will appear afterwards; yet that brought on the Diſcourſe concerning the Doctrine it ſelf of the *Proceſſion* from the *Son.* For in the *Acts* of *Smaragdus* which were ſent to *Charles* the *Great*, giving an account of this Controverſie, which are publiſhed both by *Baronius*, and *Sirmondus*; it appears that when they urge the *Pope* for his Conſent to the Addition of *Filioque*, they make uſe of this Argument, That it was a Matter of Faith, and therefore none ſhould be ignorant of it; upon which they ask the *Pope* this Queſtion; *Whether if any one doth not know or doth not believe this Article, he could be ſaved?* To which the *Pope* returns this wiſe and cautious Anſwer. *Whoſoever by the Subtilty of his Wit can reach to the knowledge of it, and knowing it, will not believe it, he cannot be ſaved. For there are many things, of which this is one, which being the deeper Myſteries of Faith, to the knowledge of them many can attain, but many others cannot, being hindred either through want of Age, or Capacity; and therefore, as we ſaid before, he that can and will not, ſhall not be ſaved.* I pray, Sir, do me the Favour to let me know your Judgment, whether this *Pope* were infallible or no? Or, will you acknowledge that he was quite *beſide the Cuſhion*, that is, not *in Cathedrâ* when he ſpake it? What? Not then, when ſolemn *Legates* were diſpatched from a *Council* purpoſely to know his Judgment in a Matter of Controverſie, which the Church was divided about? If ſo, the *Pope* ſhall never be *in Cathedrâ* but when you will have him; or if he were there, you will ſurely ſay, he did not act very Apoſtolically, when he ſpake theſe words. For, can any thing be more plain, than that the *Pope* determines this Article of the *Proceſſion* from the *Son*, to be no neceſſary Article of Faith; but acknowledgeth it to be one of the deeper *Myſteries* of *Religion* which none were obliged to believe, but ſuch as could reach to the knowledge of it; which either want of Age in ſome, Capacity in others, and invincible Prejudice in many more, might keep them from the knowledge of? Thus it appears by the *Pope's* Judgment, the denial of this could be no Hereſie then, becauſe he declares it, not to be neceſſary to be believed by all. What now muſt we think of this *Pope*, if we apply your words to him? *Were all other ſucceeding Ages blind, and this Pope only clear and ſharp-ſighted? Which Judgment of his muſt be called nothing ſhort of ſwelling Preſumption*; and if you pleaſe St. *Auſtin ſhall be quoted for it too*, but it muſt be in ſome other place, beſides that where he ſays, that *Pride is the Mother of Hereſie.* Do you think we can do other than hugely applaud our ſelves, in ſeeing you ſo furiouſly lay about you, when we know, your firſt *Blows* fall on the *Fathers*, and your ſecond cut off one *Leg* at leaſt of your *Infallible Chair.* Can we have better Security againſt you than the Judgment of one of your own *Popes?* May we not well be accounted blind, when for our ſakes *Infallibility* it ſelf muſt be ſo to? If you tell us that after-*Popes* declared otherwiſe: I have but one Requeſt to make to you, *viz.* To make it appear, that when two *Popes* ſhall determine both parts of a *Contradiction to be true*, they both are *Infallible* in doing ſo?

Baron. Annal. ad An. 809. *Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. Tom* 2. *p.* 256, 257.

Quiſquis ad hoc ſenſu ſubtiliori pertingere poteſt, & id ſcire, aut ita ſciens, credere noluerit, ſalvus eſſe non poterit. Sunt enim multa, è quibus iſtud unum eſt, ſacræ fidei altiora myſteria, ad quorum indagationem pertingere multi valent: multi vero aut ætatis quantitate, aut intelligentiæ qualitate præpediti non valent; & ideo, ut prædximus, qui potuerit, & noluerit, ſalvus eſſe non potuerit. Apud Sirmond. ubi ſupra.

§. 12. But if we proceed a little further, it may be we ſhall find the Judgment of another *Pope* agreeing with this. For which we muſt conſider that *Anno Dom.* 858. *Ignatius* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* being Impriſoned by the *Emperour Michael*, and *Photius* being placed in his room, in a *Council* held by *Photius*, *Anno Dom.* 861. *Ignatius* was condemned, upon which he being likewiſe condemned by *Pope Nicolaus* at *Rome*, he doth as much

much for him at *Conſtantinople*. So that thoſe Grudges which had been before more cloſely carried between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, did now openly diſcover themſelves. But among ſeveral other things which *Photius* charged the *Latin Church* with, the chiefeſt, and that which he inſiſts on with the greateſt vehemency, is, *That they did attempt to Corrupt and Adulterate the Holy and Sacred Symbol of Faith, which had obtained an unalterable Force by the Decrees of Synods and Councils, with falſe Senſes and new Additions, by an unmeaſurable Confidence. O their Diabolical Machinations! for by a ſtrange Innovation, they make the Holy Ghoſt proceed not only from the Father, but the Son too.* This we find in his *Encyclical Epiſtle*, Publiſhed by him on the account of the Difference between the *Latin* and the *Greek Church*, in which he largely diſputes againſt the Doctrine of the *Proceſſion of the Spirit from the Son*, and, as we ſee, charges the *Latins* with Fraud, Preſumption, and a deſire of Innovation, in the inſerting that Article into the *Creed*. Not long after, this *Pope Nicolaus* having adviſed with the *Gallican Biſhops* what to do in this buſineſs, *dies*; to whom *Adrian* ſucceeds as bitter againſt *Photius* as his Predeceſſor, and had more advantage againſt him than the other had. For, at *Conſtantinople* the *Emperour Michael* being ſlain by *Baſilius*, whom he had adopted to a Partnerſhip in the *Empire* the Year before, he preſently baniſheth *Photius*, reſtoreth *Ignatius*, calleth a *Council*, *A. D.* 869. in which *Photius* is *Anathematized*; and, for the greater Execration of him, they dipt their Pens wherewith they ſubſcribed, in the ſacred *Chalice*. This the *Latins* call the eighth *Oecumenical Synod*. Notwithſtanding all which, *Ignatius* being dead, *Photius* is reſtored by *Baſilius Macedo*, *Anno Dom.* 878. *Legates* are diſpatched to *Pope John* 8. (as in Courteſie to you we call him) who ſucceeded *Adrian*, that *Photius* might be reſtored to the Communion of the *Church* and his *Patriarchal Dignity*; which is preſently done. The Year following, a *General Council* is held at *Conſtantinople*, in which the *Pope's Legates* are preſent, and this the *Greeks* only admit for the eighth *Oecumenical*. In which all that was done againſt *Photius* is abrogated, the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* without the Addition of *Filioque* is ſolemnly read, and it is decreed againſt the *Latins*, the *Pope's Legates* conſenting, that nothing ſhould be added to the *Creed*. But leſt you ſhould think the *Pope's Legates* were practiſed upon by ſome Arts of *Photius* (for ſome of his Enemies among other Reproaches, did not ſtick to ſay, he learnt *Magick* from the famous *Santarabenus*) and that it was done without the *Pope's* free Conſent: We have his own Teſtimony afterwards in approbation of it. For *Pithæus*, an Ingenuous, as well as very Learned Man, confeſſeth, that the Letters of this *Pope* are ſtill extant among the *Latins*, by which it appears that he condemned all the *Synods* held againſt *Photius*, whether at *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*; and the *Patriarch Hieremias* (whoſe Teſtimony in other caſes you make much of) ſaith expreſly, not only that the *Pope* conſented to this *Synod*, by the *Cardinal Peter*, and *Paulus*, and *Eugenius* who were there his *Legates*; but that in an Epiſtle he writ to *Photius*, he hath theſe words. *I declare again to your Grace, concerning that Article, by which ſuch Scandals have been in the Churches of Chriſt. Aſſure your ſelf, that we not only ſpeak this, but that*

Καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον Σύμβολον, ὃ πᾶσι πίς Συνοδικοῖς καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς ψηφίσμασιν, ἄμαχον ἔχει τὴν ἰσχὺν, νόθοις λογισμοῖς, καὶ παρεγγράπτοις λόγοις, καὶ θράσυς ὑπερβολῇ κιβδηλεύειν ἐπεχείρησαν· ὦ τῶν τῆ πονηρᾶ μηχανημάτων! τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ ἐκ τῆ Παλρὸς μόνον, ἀλλά γε καὶ ἐκ τῆ Υἱῆ, ἐκπορεύεσθαι, καινολογήσαντες. Photius ep. 7. p. 51.

Opuſcul. edit. Lutet. 1609.

that we really judge, Those who first durst out of their Presumption do this, to be Transgressors of the sacred Oracles, changers of the Doctrine of our Lord Christ, and the Holy Fathers, and we place them in the Society of Judas. What Article was this, I pray, which the *Pope* is so zealous against? Even no other than that *which you account all blind who do not esteem the denial of it Heresie.* It seems then we have one more added to the number of the Heretical *Popes*; for, *Photius* himself could not express more Vehemency against this Article than the *Pope* doth, and that when by his *Legates* in a *Council* (therefore *Infallible*, according to you, because confirmed by the *Pope*) he had declared himself utterly against the Addition of this *Article* to the *Creed.* And instead of accounting them Hereticks who denied it, you see how much worse than *Hereticks* he accounted them who first added it. So that I wonder, you do not rather account the belief of that Article *Heresie*, than the denial of it. I know well enough, how your Party rail here to purpose against *Photius*; but what is all that to the Business? Let *Photius* be what he will, Were not the *Pope's Legates* present at the *Council?* Did not they confirm the Decrees of it? Did not the *Pope* afterwards Ratifie it? So that if ever Council were Infallible according to your Principles, this must be; choose therefore, either to relinquish the *Pope's* and *Councils Infallibility*, or else acknowledge that Men at one time may be infallibly guilty of violating *Scriptures*, *Fathers*, *Councils* for asserting that *Doctrine*, which they may be infallibly guilty of *Heresie* for not asserting at another. I know very well, that *Marinus* who succeeded *John* 8. at *Rome*, condemned his Predecessors Acts and *Photius* together, (for he was before imployed both by *Nicolaus* and *Adrian* in the Excommunicating and Condemning *Photius*) but what this proves I understand not, any further, than that still one *Pope* may Infallibly contradict another, or that a *Pope* without a *Council* shall be more Infallible than with one; or lastly, (which is the grand *Arcanum Imperii*) those *Popes*, and those Decrees which are for the present Interest of the *Church* of *Rome* must be owned as Infallible; but for the rest, the best Art must be used to blast them that may be. And for this you want not your many Tricks and Devices to accuse Authors of Forgery, cry out on them for Hereticks, rail out of measure when you have nothing else to say; or if after all this, Testimonies stand of force against you, then nothing is left, but *Excogitato commento detorquere in alium sensum*, to find out some Trick to wrest them to another Sense, as the Authors of the *Belgick Index Expurgatorius* professed in the Case of *Bertram.* But for all Men who think it not lawful to say any thing in a bad Cause, this may certainly be sufficient to shew, that if *Fathers* and *Councils* may be relyed on, if *Popes* and *Councils* be Infallible, that was not accounted an Heresie by them, which you condemn for such in the *Greek Church.*

Πάλιν παραδηλοῦμαι τῇ σῇ αἰδεσμιότητι, περὶ τοῦ ἄρθρου τούτου, δι' ὃ συνέβη τὰ σκάνδαλα μέσον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν χριστοῦ· ἔχε πρὸς ἡμᾶς πληροφορίαν, ὅτι οὐ μόνον λέγομεν τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πρώτους θαῤῥήσαντας τῇ ἑαυτῶν οὐτονοίᾳ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, παραβάτας κρίνομεν τῶν θείων λόγων, καὶ μεταποιητὰς τῆς θεολογίας τῶν δεσπόπου χριστοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰούδα αὐτοὺς τάττομεν. Acta Theolog. Wirtenberg. Resp. 2. Patriarch. p. 213, 214.

Having thus discovered, that this Opinion you condemn for *Heresie* in the *Greek Church*, was otherwise esteemed both by *Fathers*, *Oecumenical Councils, and Popes*; I come to that which you seem to rely on for making it Heretical, *viz. That the* Greeks *and* Latins *both together condemned it for Heretical in the* General Council *at* Florence. Although it might be worth our while to enquire how far any *General Council* can either make or declare that to be a necessary Article of Faith, which was determined to be otherwise by former *General Councils.* But omitting that at present which §. 13.

which we may have a fitter occaſion to diſcuſs in the Queſtion of *Fundamentals*, and the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*; I therefore come to examine the Matter of Fact in the *Florentine Council*, concerning the determination of this Opinion there as *Heretical*. Wherein if we conſider the time in which, and the occaſion upon which this *Council* was call'd, if we conſider the way of the managery of it, the *Arts* whereby the *Greeks* were drawn to this conſent, the manner of propoſing the *Decrees* of it, or the acceptance which it found in the *Greek Church*, upon none of theſe reſpects we ſhall have cauſe to look upon it as a *Free* and *General Council*, determining that Opinion as *Heretical*, which you ſay was ſo determined here. In all which we muſt profeſs how much we are obliged to that faithful and impartial Account of all the Proceedings relating to this *Council*, written by *Sylveſter Sguropulus*, one preſent at the moſt ſecret Negotiations of it, tranſcribed out of the *MS.* in the *King* of *France* his *Library*, by *Claudius Serravius*, and firſt publiſhed for the general Good of the World by our Learned *Dean of Wells*. It appears then, that which gave the firſt riſe to the thoughts of Union between the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*, was the miſerable condition which the *Greek Empire* was now reduced to, by the Incurſions of the *Turks* and *Saracens*. For it ſeems for thirty Years, (before that an *Embaſſadour* was ſent to *Rome* from *Manuel Palæologus* to negotiate the Buſineſs of the Union) from the time of the *Patriarch Nilus*, and *Pope Urban*, there had been no entercourſe at all between the *Popes* and *Patriarchs*, but now upon this Addreſs made to them by the *Greeks*, the Popes careſs them with all imaginable Kindneſs, feed them high with Promiſes, engage their utmoſt to promote this Union, (well knowing with what Advantage to themſelves it might be managed in this *Critical* Juncture of their Affairs.) For now *Amurath* 2. having ſubdued *Peloponneſus*, had advanced almoſt to the Walls of *Conſtantinople*, and therefore when the *Pope* ſent one to the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* to appoint a Day for the *Council*, they told him they could not then have leiſure to think of *Councils*; and if they had, by reaſon of the Fury of the Wars the *Biſhops* could not be aſſembled together to make a full *Council*. But it ſeems the State of Affairs grew worſe ſtill with them, and the *Dead-palſie* of *Manuel Palæologus* was but an *Emblem* of a *worſe* in the *State*, the *Empire* being brought daily into greater Dangers. Which put *Johannes Palæologus* upon further thoughts, how any Help or Relief might be had from the *Weſt* in this Extremity. But they might eaſily underſtand the Terms of that *Union* from the Speech of the *Cardinals* to the *Emperour's Legates*, That the *Roman Church* was the *Mother*, and the *Eaſtern* only the *Daughter*, and therefore it was but fit that the *Daughter* ſhould ſubmit to the *Mother*; That for their parts, they would not leave the Deciſion of this Controverſie to multitudes of Voices, (it ſeems then they had high thoughts of the Infallibility of *General Councils*) but three ſhould be choſen on either ſide, who being apart by themſelves ſhould invoke *God*, and whatever he ſhould reveal to them, that all ſhould conſent to: For he that hath ſaid, that *Where two or three are gathered together in his Name he would be in the midſt of them*; *he that made the Aſs to ſpeak* (the Cardinal's own Argument) *would not fail of letting them know his Will Infallibly, which was to be received from them by all others*. (There may be then a much readier way for Infallibility, than by *Pope* and *Councils*.) But if nothing elſe would ſatisfie but a *Council*, it muſt be in *Italy*, contrary to the *Pope's* Promiſe before, that it ſhould be at *Conſtantinople*; but when they urged the vaſtneſs of the Expence, and unſuitableneſs of it to their preſent Neceſſities; rather than a matter like-

Sylveſter Sguropul. Hiſtor. Concil. Florent. ſect. 2. c. 10.

Sect. 2. c. 12.

ly

ly to be ſo much for the advantage of the *See* of *Rome* ſhould not go forward, the *Pope* proffers to advance a conſiderable Sum of Money for the defraying the Charges of the *Greeks*, both in coming to, and abiding at the *Council*. Which thoſe who underſtand not the *Intrigues* of that *Court*, would have thought had been far better ſpent in a preſent ſupply of the *Greek Emperour*, the better to have enabled him to defend the *Chriſtian Churches* from the Invaſion of their Enemies. But any one who looks into the management of things, will eaſily diſcern upon what grounds the *Pope* choſe rather a dilatory proceeding, drawing the *Emperour* and ſo many *Biſhops* from *Greece* into *Italy* at that time, and all the while to feed them with rich Promiſes of Aſſiſtance, upon condition that the *Union* was accompliſhed; but at laſt after two years attendance (for ſo long the *Council* continued at *Ferrara* and *Florence*) the poor *Emperour* was ſent home as empty as he came, and found things in a much worſe condition than he left them. Which could not rationally be expected to be otherwiſe. When the *Greeks* knew c. 17. 18. that the *Emperour* had aſſented that the *Council* ſhould be in *Italy*, they began ſtrangely to be troubled at it, ſome reſolved never to communicate more in the *Councils* of the *Union*; the *Patriarch* often ſaid, that he knew no good Iſſue could come of a *Council* held in the *Pope's* Territories; and if they muſt receive their allowance from the *Pope*, what did they elſe but therein confeſs themſelves his *Vaſſals* already, and therefore nothing could be expected from them, but to do juſt what he would have them; or elſe he might eaſily ſtarve them into conſent and approbation of his Will. For they ſhould be wholly under his Power, and if he denied their Stipends, there was no poſſibility of getting from him. Was not this then like to be a very *free Council?* And it proved accordingly: For when they were at *Council* the *Pope* kept them ſhort enough, ſo that many of them were reduced to the greateſt Neceſſities, and were not ſuffered unleſs by ſtealth to go ſo much as out of the *Gates* of the City, as *Beſſarion* himſelf once found, *Sect.* 6. c. 1. when he attempted it at *Florence*. But notwithſtanding all the perſwaſions of the wiſeſt of his *Councellors* at home to the contrary, notwithſtanding *Sect.* 3. c. 12. an Expreſs from the *Emperour Sigiſmund* to diſſwade the *Greek Emperour* in the preſent ſtate of Affairs from this Journey into *Italy*, yet he was reſolved upon it, and uſed all the Arts he could before-hand to make choice of ſuch Perſons as might be moſt for his purpoſe. Himſelf, without the conſent of the *Patriarch*, appointing the *Legates* of the three other *Patriarchs* *Sect.* 3. c. 3. of *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*: And when theſe *Patriarchs* had given no other Inſtructions to theſe *Legates*, than that they ſhould have power to give their Suffrages upon theſe Terms, and no other, *That all things were carried fairly, and defined Canonically, according to the Decrees of Oecumenical Councils and Holy Fathers, ſo that nothing ſhould be added, changed, or innovated in the Symbol of Faith*; he, at the Inſtigation of one of the *Latin Legates*, then Reſident at *Conſtantinople*, ſent away to the ſeveral *Patriarchs*, for the altering their Inſtructions, upon a ſolemn Promiſe that the Conditions mentioned by them ſhould however be exactly obſerved: Which whether they were or no, will appear by the *Series* of the Story. And that we may better judge how *General* this *Council* was like to be, at the ſame time that theſe Negotiations for *Union* were on foot, the *Council* of *Baſil* was then ſitting in oppoſition to *Pope Eugenius*; to them and to the *Pope* at the ſame time, the *Emperour* diſpatched ſeveral *Legates* with the ſame Inſtructions, and both of them returned theirs to the *Emperour*, ſeeking as much as poſſible to outvy each other in large Promiſes if the *Greeks* did *Cap.* 12. joyn in *Council* with them; both which the *Emperour* held in play till he could

could ſee with whom he was like to make the beſt Terms. But as the *Romaniſts* are never backward at ſuch Arts, they had cauſed it by their Inſtru-
C. 11. ments to be reported at *Conſtantinople*, that the *Council* at *Baſil* had ſubmitted to the *Pope*, which within fifteen days was confuted by the arrival of the *Galleys* ſent from the *Council* to convey the *Greeks* over to it; upon which the *Emperour* had much to do to keep *Condelmerius* the *Pope's Nephew* from fighting the *Councils Galleys* within his view; for he ſaid, he had expreſs Order from the *Pope* to ſink them where ever he met them. And
C. 15. were not theſe fair Tendencies to a Free and *General Council?* And yet after all this, not full thirty *Biſhops* of the *Greek Church* went along with the *Patriarch*, as appears by the particular enumeration of them by *Sguropulus*: other *Officers* indeed, and *Monks*, there were to fill up the number; and yet theſe were more than the *Emperour* could well mould to his Deſigns
Sect.6.c.3. when he had them there. But the *Pope* ſoon accompliſhed the *Patriarch's* Prediction in keeping them bare enough, when they were at his finding, that he might be ſure to make them *hungry Greeks*, and then he ſuppoſed the other part of the *Proverb* would follow after. After the *Council* had begun at *Ferrara*, and continued there ſixteen *Seſſions*, wherein were many publick and ſolemn Diſputes between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, it was removed to *Florence*; where the *Greeks* ſtill underwent the ſame Hardſhips, and the *Latins* ſought to hold out at Diſputations, till the *Greeks* Neceſſity ſhould be ſo preſſing, as to neceſſitate them to an abſolute Submiſſion to the *Latin Church*. But, Reports and Meſſages coming from *Conſtantinople*, acquainting the *Emperour* with the difficulties the City was in, and the Progreſs which the Enemies made; and finding, that during the ſitting of the *Council* the *Pope* ſtill put him off and gave him nothing but words, he therefore reſolves upon another courſe; he breaks all Publick and *Conciliary* Proceedings, pretending that no Iſſue would come of thoſe Diſputations, calls a private *Cabal* of ſuch whom he knew fitteſt for his purpoſe to contrive ſome ſhorter way to put an end to this Buſineſs. For that end, makes choice firſt of ten *Perſons* of either ſide to agree upon ſome Propoſals for Union, and ac-
Sect. 8. c. 12. quaints none elſe of the *Greeks* with their Tranſactions. When theſe things took no effect, the *Patriarch* who carried on the *Emperour's* deſign, often convenes the *Greeks* together, and in plain terms perſwades them to perfect Diſſimulation, that ſince the neceſſity of Affairs was ſuch, it would be hugely for their advantage, if in ſome things they did yield to the *Latins* deſires. When they told him, that in Matters of Faith they could not do it, he replies, that if in twenty four Articles of *Faith* they yielded but in one, the ſoundneſs of *twenty three* would make amends for the *twenty fourth*. Such kind of Arguments as theſe were they driven to, to bring the *Greeks* to hear-
C. 13. ken to any Terms of *Union*. After this, the *Latins* ſent them an Explication of Faith, which if the *Greeks* would ſubſcribe, there might be an Union between them: Which being read among them, containing chiefly the acknowledgement of the *Proceſſion from the Son*, all but the four who were the *Emperour's* Inſtruments in this Work, unanimouſly diſown it: And when the
C. 14. *Emperour* urged them every one to deliver their *Suffrages* in writings, they tell him, it was contrary to the proceeding of all *Oecumenical Councils*: However, he told them he commanded them to do it. By which means rebuking
C. 16. ſome, cajoling others, he at laſt brought it by the multitude of *Suffrages*, that five Perſons were ſelected among the reſt, to draw up a *Form* of *Union*; which,
C. 18. though drawn up very favourably for the *Greeks*, yet, thoſe who were for it, did not eaſily carry it from thoſe who oppoſed it. And yet to this the *Latins* returned no leſs than twelve *Exceptions*: Upon which the *Em-*

perour

perour was fain to take a new Courſe, and exclude thoſe from the *Councils*, who were of greateſt Authority in obſtructing his Deſigns; but *Marcus Epheſius* ſtill continued in ſo great oppoſition, that he publickly charged the *Latins* Opinion with *Hereſie*. Notwithſtanding all which, when it was put to Suffrage, *Whether the Spirit did proceed from the Son*; for ten who affirmed it, there were ſeventeen who denied it, which put them yet to more Diſquietment, and new *Councils*. At firſt the *Emperour* would Vote himſelf, which when the *Patriarch* kept him from, ſome adviſed him to remove more of the Diſſenters: But, inſtead of that, they uſed a more plauſible and effectual way; the *Emperour* and *Patriarch* ſent for them ſeverally, and ſome they upbraided with Ingratitude, others they careſſed with all Expreſſions of Kindneſs, both by themſelves and their *Inſtruments*: Yet, at the laſt, they could get but 13 *Biſhops* to affirm *the Proceſſion from the Son*, all others being excluded the Power of giving Suffrage; who were accuſtomed formerly to give it, ſuch as the *great Officers* of the *Church* of *Conſtantinople*, the *Cænobiarchs* and others; but to fill up the number, all the *Courtiers* were called in, who made no diſpute, but did preſently what the *Emperour* would have them do. Having diſpatched this after this manner, the other Controverſies concerning the *Addition to the Creed*, *unleavened Bread in the Euchariſt*, *Purgatory*, *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Emperour* agreed them privately, never ſo much as communicating them to the *Greek Synod*. Among the *Emperour's* Inſtruments, the *Biſhop* of *Mitylene* went roundly to work, ſaying openly, *Let the Pope give me ſo many Florens to be diſtributed to whom I think fit, and I make no queſtion but to bring them in very readily to ſubſcribe the Union*; which he accordingly effected; and the ſame way was taken with ſeveral others: By which, and other Means, moſt of thoſe who were excluded from the *Suffrages*, were at laſt perſwaded to *Subſcribe*. This is the ſhort account of the Management of thoſe Affairs at *Florence*, which are more particularly and largely proſecuted by the Author, wherein we ſee what Clandeſtine Arts, what Menaces, and Inſinuations, what Threats and Promiſes were uſed to bring the poor *Greeks* to conſent to this pretended *Union*. For it afterwards appeared to be no more than pretended; for the infinitely greater number of *Biſhops* at home refuſed it, and theſe very *Biſhops* themſelves, when they ſaw what Arts were uſed in it, fell off from it again, and the *Emperour* found himſelf at laſt deceived in his great expectations of help from the *Latins*. Muſt we then acknowledge this for a *Free and General Council*, which hath a Promiſe of *Infallibility* annexed to the Definitions of it? Shall we from hence pronounce the *Greeks Doctrine* to be *Heretical*, when for all theſe Proceedings, yet at laſt no more was agreed on, than that they did both believe *the Proceſſion from the Son*, without condemning the other Opinion as *Heretical*, as you pretend, which the *Greeks* would never have conſented to? Or *Anathematizing* the Perſons who denied it, as was uſual in former *General Councils*, who did ſuppoſe it not enough to have it virtually done by the poſitive Definition, but did expreſly and formally do it. For when this *Anathematizing* Diſſenters was propounded among the *Greeks* by *Beſſarion* of *Nice*, and *Iſidore* of *Ruſſia* (who for their great Service to the *Pope* in this Buſineſs were made *Cardinals*) it was refuſed by the reſt, who were zealous promoters of the *Union*. This I have at large (more out of a deſign to vindicate the *Greek Church*, than being neceſſitated to it by any thing you produce) ſhewed, that there is no reaſon from *Authority*, either before or after the *Council* of *Florence*, to charge the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*.

Sect. 9. c. 4.
c. 5.
c. 8.
c. 9.
c. 10.
Sect. 10. c. 1.
c. 4.

§. 14. I now come to the Examination of your *Theological Reaſon*, by which you think you have ſo evidently proved the *Greeks* Opinion to be *Hereſie*, that
P. 6. you introduce it with Confidence in abundance. *But*, ſay you, *though this Perſwaſion had not been atteſted by ſuch clouds of Witneſſes, Theological Reaſon is ſo ſtrong a Foundation to confirm it, that I wonder how rational Men could ever be induced to queſtion the Truth of it.* Still you ſo unadviſedly place your Expreſſions, that the ſharpeſt which you uſe againſt your Adverſaries return with more force upon your ſelf: For it being ſo fully cleared, that theſe *clouds of Witneſſes* are *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Popes* againſt you. What do you elſe by this Expreſſion, but exclude them from the number of *Rational Men*, becauſe, forſooth, not acquainted with the depth of your *Theological Reaſon?* But, *Is not this to make all the Churches of* Chriſtendom *for many hundred years quite blind, and your ſelf only clear and ſharp ſighted? Which ſwelling Preſumption what Spirit it argues*, &c. You ſee we need no other Weapons againſt you, but your immediate preceeding words. What pity it is, that the *Fathers* and *Councils* had not been made acquainted with this grand Secret of your *Theological Reaſon?* But happy we that have it at ſo cheap a rate! but it may be that is it which makes us eſteem it no more. But ſuch as it is, it being *Reaſon* and *Theological* too, it deſerves the great-
Sect. 9. n. 1. p. 24. eſt reſpect that may be, if it makes good its Title. *His Lordſhip* had ſaid, *That ſince the* Greeks, *notwithſtanding this Opinion of theirs, deny not the Equality, or Conſubſtantiality of the Perſons in the Trinity, he dares not deny them to be a true Church for this Opinion, though he grants them Erroneous in it.* To this you reply, *Is it (think you) enough to aſſert the Divinity, and Conſubſtantiality, and Perſonal Diſtinction of the Holy Ghoſt (as the Biſhop ſays) to ſave from Hereſie the denial of his Proceſſion from the Father and the Son as from one Principle?* But why is it not enough? Your *Theological Reaſon* is that we want, to convince us of the contrary; That therefore follows. *Would not he that ſhould affirm the Son to be a diſtinct Perſon from, and Conſubſtantial to the Father, but denied his Eternal Generation from him, be an Heretick? Or he, who held the Holy Ghoſt, diſtinct from, and Conſubſtantial to them both, but affirmed his Proceſſion to be from the Son only, and not from the Father, be guilty of Hereſie? It is then moſt evident, that not only an Errour againſt the Conſubſtantiality and Diſtinction, but againſt the Origination, Generation, and Proceſſion of the Divine Perſons, is ſufficient matter of Hereſie.* Your faculty at *clinching* your Arguments, is much better than of *driving them in:* For your Concluſion is *moſt evident*, when your Premiſes have nothing *like Evidence* in them. For, 1. He that doth acknowledge the *Son* to be *Conſubſtantial* with the *Father*, and yet a diſtinct Perſon from him, muſt needs therein acknowledge his *Eternal Generation*: For how he ſhould be the *Son* of the ſame Nature with *God*, and yet having a diſtinct *Perſonality* as a *Son*, without *Eternal Generation*; is ſo hard to underſtand, that I muſt confeſs, that whoever aſſerts the one, and denies the other, is ſo far from *Theological Reaſon*, that I think he hath no *common Reaſon* in him. Is this then, think you, a parallel Caſe with the Proceſſion of the *Spirit* from the *Son*, which may be ſuppoſed *Conſubſtantial* to *Father* and *Son*, and a diſtinct Perſon from both, without any Connotation of Reſpect to the *Perſonality* of the *Son*, as a Principle of *Spiration?* 2. He that ſhould affirm the *Proceſſion* of the *Spirit* only from the *Son*, and not the *Father*, would ſpeak much more abſurdly than the *Greeks* do; for thereby he would deſtroy the *Father's* being the *Fountain* or *Principle* of *Origination*, as to the diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes* of *Son* and *Spirit*; he would plainly and directly thwart the *Creed* of the *ſecond*

General

General Council; and, which is more, would ſpeak directly againſt expreſs words of *Scripture*, which ſay, *The Spirit proceeds from the Father:* Which by the conſent of the *Chriſtian Church*, hath been interpreted of the Eternal Proceſſion. And by this time, I hope you begin to have better Thoughts of Rational Men, than to make ſuch a wonder at their queſtioning the *Greeks Hereſie*; but if this be your *Theological Reaſon*, one Scruple of *common Reaſon* goes far beyond it.

§. 15. We have had a fair Proof of your Skill at *Charging*, we ſhall now ſee how good you are at ſtanding your Ground. Your main Defence lies in a Diſtinction which ruines you; for you think to ward off all the Citations his Lordſhip produceth againſt you out of the *Schoolmen* and others, that the *Greeks* and *Latins* agree with each other, *in eandem fidei ſententiam, upon the ſame Sentence of Faith, but differ only in words*, by ſaying, *That the* Greeks *muſt be diſtinguiſhed into Ancient and Modern. The Ancient*, you ſay, *expreſſed themſelves* per filium, *but they meant thereby* à filio: *Whereas the Modern* Greeks *will not admit that Expreſſion* à filio: *but* per filium *only, and that too in a Senſe diſſignificative to* à filio. This is the Subſtance of all the Anſwer you give, both in general, and to the particular Authorities for ſeveral Pages; the Diſproof therefore of this Diſtinction, muſt, by your own Confeſſion, make all thoſe Teſtimonies ſtand good againſt you; which I ſhall do by two things. 1. By ſhewing that the *Ancient Greeks* did aſſert as much as the Modern do in this Controverſie. 2. That thoſe who ſpeak expreſly of the *Modern Greeks*, do deny their difference from us in any Matter of Faith. 1. That the Ancient *Greeks* did aſſert as much as the *Modern* do. By the Ancient *Greeks*, we muſt here underſtand thoſe who writ before the *Schoolmen*, whoſe Teſtimonies you would anſwer by this Diſtinction. Now nothing can be more clear, than that thoſe *Greeks* who writ before them, did as peremptorily deny *the Proceſſion from the Son*, as any of the *Modern Greeks* do. We have already produced the Teſtimony of *Theodoret*, who accounts the contrary Opinion Blaſphemous and Impious; and that of *Photius*, who ſo largely and vehemently diſputes againſt the Proceſſion from the Son. To whom I ſhall add two more of great Reputation, not only in the *Greek*, but in the *Latin Church*; and thoſe are *Theophylact* and *Damaſcen. Theophylact*, whether he lived in the time of *Photius*, about 870, as the common opinion is, or more probably in the time of *Michael Cerularius*, as great an Adverſary as *Photius* to the *Latins*, about 1070, yet was long enough before the *Schoolmen:* For *Peter Lombard* flouriſhed, *A. D.* 1145. and *Thomas* and *Bonaventure*, about 1260. So that in this reſpect he muſt be one of the *Ancient Greeks*; He therefore delivers his Opinion as expreſly as may be in his *Commentaries* on St. *John*; and that not as his own private Opinion, but as the common Senſe of the *Greek Church*; for there taking occaſion to ſpeak *how the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son. For the Latins*, ſaith he, *apprehend it amiſs, and miſtaking it, ſay, That the Spirit proceeds from the Son. But we anſwer, That it is one thing to ſay, The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, which we aſſert; and another, that it proceeds from the Son, which we deny; for it hath no Teſtimony of Scripture for it, and then we muſt bring in two Principles, the Father and the Son.* And withal adds, that when *Chriſt* breathed the Spirit on his Diſciples, it is not to be underſtood *Perſonally*, but in regard of the Gift of Remiſſion of Sins; after which, he briefly

P. 7. n. 5.

Theophylact. in Joh. 3. 26.

οἱ γὰρ Λατῖνοι κακῶς ταῦτα ἐκδεχόμενοι καὶ ἀδιανοήτως φασὶν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεται. Theophylact. in Joh. 3.

and

and comprehenſively ſets down the Opinion of the *Greek Church*: *Believe thou that the Spirit doth proceed from the Father, but is given to Men by the Son; and let this be the Rule of ſound Doctrine to thee.* And what now do the *Modern Greeks* ſay more than *Theophylact* did? Or what do they ſay leſs; for they acknowledge, that the *Spirit* is the *Spirit* of the *Son* as well as he? To the ſame purpoſe *Damaſcen*, who lived between the 6th and 7th *Synod*, about *A. D.* 730. in the time of *Leo Iſaurus*, delivers the ſenſe of the *Greek Church* in his time concerning this Article. *It muſt be conſidered*, ſaith he, *That we aſſert not the Father to be from any, but that he is ſaid to be the Father of the Son. We ſay not, that the Son is a proper Cauſe, neither the Father; but we ſay, the Son is from the Father, and of the Father. The Holy Spirit, we ſay, is from the Father, and of the Father; but we ſay not, the Spirit is from the Son, but we call him the Spirit of the Son; And we confeſs, that by the Son, the Spirit is manifeſted and given to us.* Theſe words are ſo plain, that the *Patriarch Hieremias* producing them, ſaith, *Nothing can be more clear and evident than theſe words are.* But the *Philoſopher*, who was ſo much pleaſed to ſee the *Aſs mumble his Thiſtles*, could not take much leſs Contentment to ſee how the *Schoolmen* handle this Teſtimony of *Damaſcen*. For, being very loth that ſo zealous an Aſſertor of *Images*, ſhould in any thing ſeem oppoſite to the *Church* of *Rome*, they very handſomly, and with wonderful Subtilty bring him off, by admiring the Wiſdom and Caution he uſeth, in theſe words. So your own St. *Bonaventure*, whoſe Teſtimony you think ſo conſiderable, as to produce at large, *Tamen ipſe cautè loquitur, unde non dicit quod Spiritus non eſt à filio, ſed dicit non dicimus à filio*, which you put in great Letters, the more to be taken notice of. But, I pray, What was it which *Damaſcen* was there delivering of? Was it not the Senſe of the *Greek Church* concerning the *Perſons* of the *Trinity?* And how could he otherwiſe have expreſſed it, than by *non dicimus*; but if this muſt argue what *Bonaventure* and *you* would have from it (for this is the only Teſtimony you give of your Diſtinction of *Ancient* and *Modern Greeks*) will it not as well hold for the other things before-mentioned concerning the *Father* and the *Son*, where he uſeth *dicimus & non dicimus*, as well as here? And therefore *Aquinas* was much wiſer, who plainly condemns *Damaſcen* for a *Neſtorian* in this, *licet à quibuſdam dicatur, &c.* although it be ſaid by ſome, that in theſe words *he neither affirms or denies it*: Wherein I am much miſtaken, if he reflects not on *Bonaventure*. *Vaſquez*, *Petavius*, and ſeveral others think to bring *Damaſcen* off by the *diſtinctions* of *à filio*, and *per filium*, much to your purpoſe: But in the great Diſpute at the *Council* at *Florence*, between *Beſſarion* and *Marcus Epheſius*, about the Importance of the Particles ἐξ and διὰ, *Marcus Epheſius* produceth the words of *Damaſcen* expreſly, that the *Spirit doth not proceed from the Son, but by the Son*, whereby it is plain, that he underſtood *per filium*, in oppoſition to *à filio*. And *Beſſarion* had nothing elſe to return in Anſwer to it, but that he could produce but *one* out of *Antiquity*, who ſaid ſo. Thus we ſee, if *Theophylact* and *Damaſcen*,

Πίστευε σὺ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τῦ πατρὸς μὲν προϊέναι, διὰ υἱῦ δὲ χορηγεῖσθαι τῇ κτίσει· καὶ ἔτός ἐσαι σοι καλὸν ὀρθοδοξίας. Id. ib.

Χρὴ γινώσκειν, ὅτι τὸ πατέρα ἐ λέγομεν ἐκ τινός, λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸν τῦ υἱῦ πατέρα· τὸ δὲ υἱὸν ἐ λέγομεν αἴτιον, ἀλλὰ πατέρα· λέγομεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκ τῦ πατρὸς, καὶ υἱὸν τῦ πατρός· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ἐκ τῦ πατρὸς λέγομεν, καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς ὀνομάζομεν, ἐκ τῦ υἱῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐ λέγομεν· πνεῦμα δὲ υἱῦ ὀνομάζομεν.—καὶ διὰ υἱῦ πεφανερῶσθαι καὶ μεταδίδοσθαι ἡμῖν ὁμολογοῦμεν. Joh. Damaſcenus de Trinit. c. 8. & l. 1. de Orthodoxa fide c. 11.

Acta Theolog. Wirten. p. 220.

P. 8.

Sum. 1. q. 36. art. 2. Vaſquez in Thom. To. 2. diſ. 146. c. 7. Petavius dogm. Theol. To. 2. l. 7. c. 17.

ἐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτῦ ἀλλ' ὡς διὰ αὐτῦ ἐκ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. Hiſt. Concil. Florent. ſect. 8. c. 15. p. 239.

ſen, as well as *Theodoret* and *Photius*, be *Ancient Greeks*; your diſtinction comes to nothing. But beſides this, it appears by the Diſputations of *Hugo Etherianus* againſt the *Greeks*, who lived, ſaith *Bellarmin*, *A. D.* 1160. ſtill extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that the *Greeks* held the very ſame then that they do now. And ſo in the *Synod* of *Bar* in *Apulia*, when *Anſelm* diſputed ſo ſtoutly againſt the *Greeks*, that *Pope Urban* ſaid, he was, *alterius orbis Papa*, as the Story is related by *Eadmerus* and *Wilhelmus Malmesburienſis*; it appears, they denied the *Proceſſion of the Spirit abſolutely from the Son*; (and this was, *A. D.* 1096.) as is evident from the Letter of *Hildebertus* to him about the publiſhing his Diſputation, and from the *Book* of *Anſelm* ſtill extant on that Subject. We find not therefore any ground for this Diſtinction of yours concerning the *Ancient* and *Modern Greeks*; and therefore they who ſaid, that there was no real difference in any Matter of Faith between the *Ancient Greeks and Latins*, muſt be underſtood as well of the *Modern Greeks*, as them: Their words being no more capable of ſuch a tolerable Interpretation as you ſpeak of, than the words of any of the *Modern Greeks* are.

Eadmer. de vita Anſelm. l. 2. Malmesbu. de geſtis Pontif. Angl. l. 1.

His *Lordſhip* was proving, that the Point was not Fundamental, that the *Greeks* and *Latins* differed in, *from that acknowledgment of* Peter Lombard, *and the Schoolmen*; *that is to ſay, The Holy Ghoſt is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and that he is, or proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not to ſpeak different things, but the ſame ſenſe in different words. Now in this cauſe*, ſaith he, *where the words differ, but the ſentence of Faith is the ſame* (penitùs eadem) *even altogether the ſame, can the Point be Fundamental? But*, ſay you, *he was to prove, that ſuch as were in grievous Errour in Divinity, erred not fundamentally*; *and for proof of this, he alledges ſuch as have no real Errour at all in Divinity.* But do you not herein wilfully miſtake his *Lordſhip's* Meaning? For in the Paragraph foregoing, his *Lordſhip* firſt declares his own Judgment concerning the denying the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt *viz. That he did acknowledge it to be a grievous Errour in Divinity*: But yet he could not judge the *Greeks* guilty of a fundamental Errour, which he proves by a double Medium. 1. *Becauſe they did not thereby deny the Equality and Conſubſtantiality of the Perſons.* 2. *Becauſe divers learned Men were of opinion*, [*that* à filio, & per filium] *in the ſenſe of the* Greek *Church, was but a Queſtion in* modo loquendi, *and therefore not fundamental*; now for this he produceth thoſe Teſtimonies. Now, I pray, do you put no difference between *the making a denial of a Propoſition to be an Errour, and the ſaying, that ſuch Perſons are guilty of the denial of that Propoſition?* His Lordſhip grants the *denial of the Proceſſion to be a grievous Errour in Divinity*, but he queſtioned (*as the* Greeks *expreſſed themſelves*, for thoſe very words he inſerts) whether they were guilty of *denying that Propoſition*, as appears by the Authorities of the *Schoolmen*, and therefore certainly much leſs guilty of a fundamental Errour. Thus you ſee his *Lordſhip* fully proves what he intends; for if they agreed in Senſe, they were much leſs guilty of a fundamental Errour, than if they had plainly denied the Proceſſion, which he ſuppoſeth from thoſe *Authorities* that they did not. And therefore when you *Sarcaſtically* ask, *Is not this ſtrong Logick?* The only anſwer I ſhall give you, is, That if you apprehend it not to be ſo, it is *becauſe of the weakneſs of your Theological Reaſon.* And therefore you put his *Lordſhip's* Defender on a ſtrange Task, *to prove from thoſe Authorities, that thoſe* Greeks *who err grievouſly in Divinity, err not fundamentally.* When the only Deſign of his *Lordſhip*, in producing thoſe Authorities, was to ſhew, that according to their opinion, the *Greeks* were ſo far from erring fundamen-

§. 16.

P. 25.

P. 8.

damen-

damentally, that *they did not err grievouſly in Divinity.* And to this purpoſe the Citation of *Peter Lombard* was pertinent, *who ſaith, That becauſe the* Greeks *acknowledge, that the Holy Ghoſt is the Spirit of the Son, though he doth not proceed from him; therefore the difference between the* Greeks *and the* Latins, *is in Words, and not in Senſe*; but, you ſay, *He ſpeaks only of ſuch as differed in Words, and not in Subſtance*; as though he put a difference between the *Greeks*, that ſome differed in words, and others really, which is quite beſide his meaning: For he takes not the leaſt notice of any ſuch Difference among themſelves; but ſaith, The Difference it ſelf concerning the *Proceſſion*, the *Greeks* acknowledging the *Holy Ghoſt* to be the *Spirit* of the *Son*, is more *verbal* than *real.* And that the preſent *Greeks* ſay full as much, is evident; for they acknowledge the ſame things in expreſs words. The Teſtimony of *Bonaventure* hath been already conſidered, as far as concerns *Damaſcen*; as for the reſt, it was ſufficient for his *Lordſhip's* purpoſe, to produce ſuch a Confeſſion from ſo bitter an Enemy of the *Greeks*, as *Bonaventure* was (ſo his Lordſhip in his Marginal Citation ſays truly of him, *licèt Græcis infenſiſſimus*, &c.) That he doth not deny, but that Salvation might be had without the Article of *Filioque*; but whether on that ſuppoſition there were ſufficient reaſon to add it to the *Creed*, will be conſidered afterwards. *Though* Bonaventure *held the* Greeks *to be Hereticks and Schiſmaticks*, I hope you do not think, that is Argument enough to perſwade us that they were ſo. *That any thing, without which Salvation might have been had before, may, by the definition of your Church, become ſo neceſſary, that Men cannot be ſaved without the belief of it*, had need be more than barely aſſerted either by *Bonaventure*, or you; and we muſt wait for the proof of it, for any thing here ſaid by either of you. That the *Greeks* might be excuſed by *Ignorance*, before ſuch *Declaration* of your *Church concerning the Filioque*, and not be excuſed after through greater Ignorance of any ſuch *Power* in your *Church, to declare ſuch things to be Matters of Faith*, is an aſſertion not eaſie to be ſwallowed by ſuch as have any ſtrength of *Logick*, or one *Drachm* of *Theological Reaſon:* Or elſe it is a very ſtrange thing, you ſhould think it ſufficient for the *Greeks* to know, what your *Church* had declared without an antecedent Knowledge that your *Church had power to declare.* How much you anſwer at random, appears by your anſwering *Aquinas* his *Teſtimony*, inſtead of that of *Jodocus Clictoveus*, as is plain enough in his Lordſhip's Margin; and you might have been eaſily ſatisfied that it was ſo, if you had taken the pains to look into either of them. But the Art of it was, *Aquinas* his Teſtimony might be eaſily anſwered, becauſe he ſpeaks only by hear-ſay, *concerning the Opinion of ſome certain Greeks*; but *Clictoveus* his was cloſe to the purpoſe, who plainly confeſſeth, that the difference of the *Ancient* Greeks *was more in words, and the manner of explaining the Proceſſion than in the thing it ſelf.* This therefore you thought fit to ſlide by, and anſwer *Aquinas* for him. Your anſwer to *Scotus* depends on the former diſtinction of *Ancient* and *Modern Greeks*, and therefore falls with it. *Bellarmine*'s anſwer concerning *Damaſcen*, and your own after *Bonaventure* of his *non dicimus*, hath been ſufficiently diſproved already. What *Tolet* holds, or the *Lutherans* deny, the words of neither being of either ſide produced, deſerve no further Conſideration.

Sentent. 1. diſt. 11.

In ſent. l. 1. diſt. 11. art. 1. q. 1.

§. 17. You tell us, his Lordſhip's Argument depends upon this, *That the Holy Ghoſt may be equal and conſubſtantial with the Son, though it proceed not from him; which*, you ſay, *is a matter too deep for his Lordſhip to wade into.* But any indifferent Reader would think it had been your Concernment to have ſhewn the contrary, that thereby you might ſeem to make good ſo heavy a Charge,

Ibid.

as

as that of *Hereſie* againſt the whole *Greek Church*. For, if the *Holy Ghoſt* cannot be equal and conſubſtantial with the *Son*, if it proceeds not from the *Son*; then it follows, that they who deny this Proceſſion, muſt deny that *Equality* and *Conſubſtantiality* of the *Spirit* with the *Son*: Which you ought to prove, to make good your Charge of Hereſie: But on the other ſide, if the *Spirit* may be proved to be *God* by ſuch Arguments as do not at all infer his *Proceſſion from the Son*; then his Equality and Conſubſtantiality doth not depend upon that Proceſſion: For I ſuppoſe you grant, that it is the *Unity of Eſſence* in the Perſons which make them equal and conſubſtantial; but we may ſufficiently prove the *Spirit* to be *God* by ſuch Arguments as do not infer the Proceſſion from the *Son*; as I might eaſily make appear by all the Arguments inſiſted on to that purpoſe: But I only mention that which the ſecond *General Council* thought moſt cogent to that purpoſe, which is the *Spirit's Eternal Proceſſion from the Father*; if that proves the *Spirit to be God*, then its Equality with the Son, is proved without his Proceſſion from the Son; for I hope you will not ſay, that the proving his Proceſſion from the Father, doth imply Proceſſion from the Son too: Becauſe the Proceſſion cannot be ſuppoſed to be from the Eſſence, for then the *Spirit* would proceed from it ſelf, but from the *Hypoſtaſis*, and therefore one cannot imply the concurrence of the other. And ſince you pretend ſo much to underſtand theſe depths; before you renew a Charge of Hereſie againſt the *Greek Church* in this Particular, make uſe of your *Theological Reaſon* in giving an intelligible Anſwer to theſe Queſtions: 1. Why the *Spirit* may not be equal and conſubſtantial to the other Perſons in the *Trinity*, ſuppoſing his Proceſſion to be only from the *Father*, as the *Son* to be Equal and Conſubſtantial with *them*, when his *Generation* is only from the *Father*. 2. If the Proceſſion from the *Son* be neceſſary to make the Spirit Conſubſtantial with the *Son*, why is not Generation of the *Son* by the *Spirit* neceſſary to make the *Son* conſubſtantial with the *Spirit*? 3. If the *Spirit* doth proceed from *Father* and *Son* as diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes*, how can he proceed from theſe *Hypoſtaſes* as one Principle by one common Spiration, without confounding their *Perſonalities*? Or elſe, ſhew how two diſtinct *Hypoſtaſes* always remaining ſo, can concur in the ſame numerical Action *ad intra*? 4. If there be ſuch a neceſſity of believing this as an Article of Faith, why hath not *God* thought fit to reveal to us, the diſtinct *Emanations* of the *Son* and *Spirit*; and wherein the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son* may be conceived as diſtinct from the *Proceſſion of the Spirit*, when both equally agree in the ſame *Eſſence*, and neither of them expreſs the *Perſonality* of the *Father*? Either, I ſay, undertake intelligibly to reſolve theſe things, or elſe ſurceaſe your Charge of *Hereſie* againſt the *Greek Church*, and upbraid not his Lordſhip for not entring into theſe Depths. Methinks, there being confeſſed to be Depths on both ſides, might teach you a little more Modeſty in handling them, and much more Charity to Men who differ about them. For you may ſee, the *Greeks* want not great plauſibleneſs of Reaſon on their ſide, as well as Authority of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, plain for them, but not ſo againſt them. As long therefore as the *Greek Church* confeſſeth the *Divinity*, *Conſubſtantiality*, *Eternal Proceſſion* of the *Spirit*; and acknowledgeth it to be *the Spirit of the Son*, there muſt be ſomething more in it than the bare denial of the Proceſſion from the Son, which muſt make you ſo eager in your Charge of Hereſie againſt her. The truth is, there is ſomething elſe in the matter; by this Article of *Filioque*, the Authority of the *Church* of *Rome* in Matters of Faith is ſtruck at: And therefore, if this be an *Hereſie*, it muſt be on the account

of denying the Plenitude of her Power in Matters of Faith, as *Anſelm* and *Bonaventure* ingenuouſly confeſs it, and plead it on that account. And therefore wiſe Men are not apt to believe, but that if the *Church* of *Rome* had not been particularly concerned in this *Addition* to the *Creed*; if the *Greeks* would have ſubmitted in all other things to the *Church* of *Rome*, this Charge of Hereſie would ſoon be taken off the File. But, as things ſtand, if ſhe be not found guilty of Hereſie, ſhe may be found as *Catholick* as *Rome*, and more too, and therefore there is a neceſſity for it, ſhe muſt be contented to bear it, for it is not conſiſtent with the Intereſt of the *Church* of *Rome*, that ſhe ſhould be free from *Hereſie*, *Schiſm*, &c. But if ſhe hath no ſtronger Adverſaries to make good the Charge than you, ſhe may ſatisfie her ſelf, that though the Blows be rude, yet they are given her by feeble Hands. For let us now make way for *Theological Reaſon* to enter the Liſts armed *Cap-a-pe* in Mood and Figure. For now at laſt you tell
P. 11. us, *You will argue in Form againſt his Lordſhip and the* Greek *Church together.* And thus it proceeds, *If the* Greeks *Errour be not only concerning, but againſt the Holy Ghoſt, then (according to the Biſhop's own diſtinction) they have loſt all Aſſiſtance of that Bleſſed Spirit, and are become no true Church; But their Errour is not only concerning, but againſt the Holy Ghoſt: Therefore,* &c. *The Major, or firſt Propoſition contains the Biſhop's own Doctrine, the Minor, or ſecond Propoſition* (wherein you learnedly tell us, what the Major and Minor in Syllogiſms are) *you thus prove. All Errours, ſpecially oppoſite to the particular and perſonal Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, are (according to all Divines) not only Errours concerning, but Errours againſt the Holy Ghoſt: But the* Greeks *Errour is oppoſite to the particular and perſonal Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, as is already proved:* Ergo, *their Errour is not only concerning, but againſt the Holy Ghoſt; whoſe Aſſiſtance therefore they have loſt, not only according to the firſt, but even latter Branch of the Biſhop's Diſtinction: And conſequently remain no true Church.* Now, who is there, that out of meer pity can find in his heart not to yield this to you, when you have been at ſuch pains to prove it? But things ſet out with the greateſt Formality, have not always the moſt Solidity in them. All the Force of this Argument, ſuch as it is, lies in this, that his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That the Errour of the* Greeks *was rather about the Doctrine concerning the Holy Ghoſt, than againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, which he after explains, by ſaying, *It was not ſuch an Errour, as did deſtroy the Equality or Conſubſtantiality of the Spirit with the other Perſons of the Trinity*; I pray now take his Lordſhip's Explication of himſelf, and you muſt form your Argument after another way than you have done: But you ſaw well enough, that you could not make any ſhew of an Argument but meerly from words. If I thought it worth conſidering, it were eaſie to tell you, that what is only againſt the Proceſſion from the Son, is not thereby againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, becauſe it may be the *Holy Ghoſt*, i. e. *the third Perſon in the Trinity*, though it proceed only from the *Father*. And as well you might ſay, that whatever Doctrine denies *the Son to be begotten of the Spirit*, is not only *concerning*, but *againſt* the *Son*, and urge the Conſequences upon as good Terms as you do about the *Spirit*: But ſo trifling an Argument is too much honoured by any ſerious Confutation. And, it ſeems, you were ſomething ſenſible of it your ſelf, when you ſay, *His Lordſhip ſeemed to have provided againſt the Force of it* (as who would not?) *by hinting a difference between Errours Fundamental and not Fundamental; which Point I ſhall purpoſely examine in the following Chapter.* When you therefore come to *hold forth* what is now but *hinted at*, I ſhall readily hearken to what you have to ſay.

Thus

Thus for any thing you have produced to the contrary, it ſufficiently appears, that the *Greek Church* is very unjuſtly charged with *Hereſie* by you, and that thoſe Teſtimonies which his Lordſhip produced, would as well hold for the *Modern* as *Ancient Greeks:* To which I might add the judgment of *others* of your own ſide, who ſpeak as much concerning the *Modern Greeks*, as *Thomas à Jeſu*, *Azorius* and others; but I think not that way of arguing to have much force on either ſide, and therefore paſs it over.

And come to the Debate of the *Filioque*, *with which*, you ſay, *his Lordſhip begins to quibble, on occaſion of the Pope's inſerting it into the Creed.* But I am quite of another mind, I think he ſpeaks very ſeriouſly, and with a great deal of Reaſon, when he ſaith, *And* Rome *in this particular ſhould be more moderate, if it be but becauſe this Article* (Filioque) *was added to the Creed by her ſelf. And 'tis hard to add and Anathematize too.* For what you ſay to this, *of the Holy Ghoſt's having leave to aſſiſt the Church, in adding expreſſions for the better explication of any Article of Faith: And then the Pope hath leave and command too, to Anathematize all ſuch, as ſhall not allow the uſe of ſuch expreſſions:* I commend you, that when you muſt beg ſomething, you would beg all that was to be had at once; but, before you perſwade us to the digeſting ſuch Crudities as theſe are, prove but theſe following things, 1. Where it is, that there is any promiſe of the *Holy Ghoſt's* aſſiſtance, in adding any *Articles* to the *Creed*, under pretence of better expreſſions for explication of them? 2. Suppoſing ſuch an Aſſiſtance, what ground is there to impoſe ſuch additional *Expreſſions*, ſo that thoſe who admit them not, muſt be guilty of Hereſie, and conſequently (by your Principles) incur Eternal Damnation. 3. How thoſe Expreſſions can be accounted a better *Explication* of an Article of Faith, which contain ſomething not implied in, nor neceſſarily deduced from, any other Article of Faith? 4. If this *Aſſiſtance* be promiſed to the *Church*, how any one part of that *Church*, as great a part ſtiffly oppoſing ſuch additional Expreſſions, can claim that Aſſiſtance to it ſelf; the other parts of the *Catholick Church*, utterly denying it? 5. If an aſſiſtance as to ſuch things be promiſed the *Church*, why may it not be more reaſonably preſumed to be in an *Oecumenical Council*, as that at *Epheſus* forbidding ſuch Additions, than in any part of the *Church*, which after ſuch a Decree ſhall directly contradict it? 6. What Right can the *Church* have to *Anathematize* any for the not uſing ſuch Expreſſions, which that *Church* which determines the uſe of them, doth acknowledge to be only Expreſſions for better Explication of an Article of Faith? And conſequently the denial of them cannot amount to the denial of an Article of *Faith*; but only of the better *Explication* of it. 7. If all theſe things be granted, how comes the *Pope*, *not only to have leave, but command too, to Anathematize all ſuch as uſe not theſe Expreſſions?* Where is that Command extant? How comes it to be limited to him? Is he expreſſed in it? Or doth it by neceſſary Conſequence follow from it? What good would it do us, to ſee but one of theſe proved, which you very fairly beg in the lump together: And, till you have proved them all, you may aſſure your ſelf, that we ſhall never believe that the *Pope* hath ſo much as *leave*, much leſs *command, to Add and Anathematize too.*

§. 12. P. 11.

P. 25.

As to the *Filioque*, you grant, *That many hundred Years had paſſed from the time of the Apoſtles, before* Filioque *was added to the Nicene Creed, and more ſince the Declarations and Decrees were ſufficiently publiſhed, and in all theſe Years Salvation was had without mention of Filioque.* A fair Conceſſion; and nothing is wanting to deſtroy all that you had ſaid before, but only this, that what was not once neceſſary to Salvation, cannot by any after-decla-

ration of the Church be made neceſſary, as ſhall be abundantly manifeſted in the *Controverſie of Fundamentals*. What follows, muſt be more particularly conſidered, becauſe therein you would fain remove the Article of *Filioque*, from being the cauſe of the *Schiſm* between the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, and impute it wholly to the *Pride* and *Ambition* of the
P. 15, 12. *Eaſtern Prelates*. Your words are, *But it is alſo true, That the Addition of* Filioque *to the Creed, was made many Years before the Difference brake out between the* Latins *and* Greeks; *ſo that the inſerting this word* (Filioque) *into the Creed, was not the firſt occaſion of Schiſm: But Grudges ariſing among the* Greeks, *who had been a large flouriſhing Church, with a number of moſt learned and zealous Prelates, and held the Articles ſtill, though upon emptier Heads: ſuch, quickly filled with Wind, thinking their ſwelling places, and great City of* Conſtantinople, *might hold up againſt* Rome; *they began to quarrel, not for Places (that was too mean a Motive for ſuch as look'd ſo big) but firſt they would make it appear, they could teach* Rome; *nay, they ſpied out Hereſies in it (the old way of all Hereticks) and ſo fell to queſtion the Proceſſion of the Ghoſt; and muſt needs have* Filioque *out of the Creed*. Theſe words of yours lay the charge of *Schiſm* on the *Greeks* wholly, and therefore, in order to our vindication of them from that, two things muſt be enquired into. 1. Whether it was in your *Churches Power* to make the *Addition* of *Filioque* to the *Creed*. 2. Whether the *Greeks Ambition and Pride* were the only cauſe of the *Separation* between the *Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches*.

1. Concerning the Addition of *Filioque*, two things muſt be enquired into; 1. When it began, and by whom it was added to the *Creed*. 2. Whether they who added it, had power ſo to do, and to impoſe on all others the uſe of it.

1. Concerning the time of this *Addition*, nothing ſeems more dark in *Church Hiſtory*, than the preciſe and punctual time of it. And ſo much
P. 164. you acknowledge your ſelf elſewhere. But it ſeems, it is your Concernment, to ſay, *That the Addition was made before the Difference brake out*. To that I anſwer, if you mean, that in ſome Churches the *Proceſſion from the Son* was acknowledged before that Difference, I grant it, as is clear by ſome *Councils of Toledo*; and, that the Doctrine of the Proceſſion was received in *France* too, about the time of *Charles the Great*, I acknowledge, and that it was admitted into the ſolemn Offices of the Church; but, that it was added to the *Nicene* and *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* to be received by all *Churches*; ſo that it ſhould not be lawful for any to uſe that *Creed* without ſuch Addition, that I deny to have been before the *Schiſm*, but aſſert it to have been a great occaſion of it. It is acknowledged, that in *Spain*, ſeveral *Councils of Toledo*, in their profeſſion of Faith, do mention the Proceſſion from the *Son*; but this they delivered only as their own private Judgments, and not as the publick *Creed* received by all
Dogmat. Theol. Tom. 2. l. 7. c. 2. Churches. For, *Petavius* confeſſeth, that, *in Symbolo ipſo nihil adjecerunt, they added nothing at all to the Creed*. And, although the cuſtom of ſinging the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* in the *Liturgy*, ſeems firſt to have begun in *Spain*, from whom *Petavius* ſuppoſeth, both the *French* and *Germans* received it; yet, even there it appears, it was not univerſally received. For, the Church of *Sevil* contented it ſelf ſtill with the *Mozarabick Liturgy*, in which only the bare *Nicene Creed* was uſed. You tell us indeed, *That the*
P. 164. *inſerting the Article in the Councils of* Toledo, *is ſuppoſed to have been done upon the Authority of an Epiſtle they had received from Pope* Leo: Which, though it be not barely ſuppoſed, but aſſerted with great Confidence by *Baronius*; yet, (as moſt other things in him which are brought to advance

the

the *Pope's* Authority) it hath no other ground but his confident Assertion. There being not the least shadow of Proof for it, but only that this *Leo*, in a certain Epistle of his to the *Spaniards*, did, *once upon a time*, mention, that the *Son proceeded from the Father.* Therefore, in *Spain*, I grant the Doctrine to be received; I deny the *Addition* to be made to the *Constantinopolitan Creed:* Although it be read, as added to it in the 8th or 10th *Council of Toledo*, under *Recceſuintus*, *Anno Dom.* 653. But this was still only the Declaration of their own Faith, in this Article, and no imposing it on others. In *France*, that it began to be received in publick use, *A D.* 809. must be acknowledged by the Proceedings of the *Legates* from the *Council* of *Aquisgrane* to *Pope Leo* 3. But, it appears as clearly, that *Pope Leo* did then condemn the use of it, as will be shewed afterwards. When it should creep into the *Athanasian Creed*, seems as hard to find out, as when first added to the *Constantinopolitan*; but, if we believe *Pithœus*, the whole *Creed* was of a *French Composition* (there being many Arguments to perswade us, it never was made by *Athanasius*; of which, in their due place) and *Vossius* adds, That it is very probable it was Composed about the time of *Charles the Great*, the Controversie being then so rife about the Procession. But that seems the less probable, because the Article of *Filioque* is not found in the *Ancient Copies* of that *Creed.* For *Spalatensis* saith, *That in all the* Greek *Copies he had seen, there was only mention made of the Procession from the Father.* And the *Patriarch Cyril* saith, *That not only the Symbol of* Athanasius *is adulterated among the* Latins; *but, that it is proved to be so by the more ancient and genuine Copies.* But, however this be, we deny not but the Article of Procession from the *Son*, grew into use, especially in the *Gallican* and *Spanish Churches*, before the *Schism* broke out between the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*; but, our enquiry is not concerning that, but concerning the time when it was so added to the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, that it was required to be used only with that Addition. For this you tell us, *That* Hugo Eterianus *affirms, that it was added by the Pope in a full Council at* Rome, *but he names not the Pope.* So likewise the *Latin Divines*, at the *Council* of *Florence*, pretended still, that it was added by the *Pope* in a full *Council*, but very carefully forbear the mention of the Person, or the punctual time. But, it is your unhappiness, if there be divers Opinions to be followed, to make choice of the most improbable; as you do here, when you embrace that of *Socolovius*, which is, *That the Fathers of the first Council at* Constantinople, *sending the Confession of their Faith to Pope* Damasus, *and his Council at* Rome; *the Pope and Council at* Rome *approved of their said Confession; but yet added, by way of Explication, the word* Filioque *to the Article which concerned the Holy Ghost; and this they did, to signifie, that the Holy Ghost as true God, proceeded from the Son, and was not made or created by him, as some Hereticks in those times began to teach. Neither doth he,* say you, *affirm this without Citation of some credible Authority.* I could wish you had produced it, not only for our satisfaction, but of the more learned Men of your own side, who look on this as an improbable Fiction. *Bellarmine* produceth many Arguments against it, saying, That no mention is made of it in the *Councils*, or *Theodoret's History*, who particularly relates the Letters of the *Council* to *Damasus*, and his to the *Council*; that *Leo* 3. caused the *Constantinopolitan Creed* to be inscribed in a Silver Table, without that Addition; that the *third Council* of *Toledo* used the *Creed* without

Baron. To. 5. An. 447. n. 58.

Magni Athanasii symbolum, quamvis Treveris ut plerique tradiderunt, i. e. in Gallia à Theologo tamen inter illos doctissimo acutissimoque scriptum. P. Pithœus Opusc. de process. Sp. S.

Vossius de tribus symbol. Addend. adp. 55. 31.

Spalatensis de Rep. Eccles. Tom. 3. l. 7. c. 10. sect. 124.

Patriarch. Cyril. ep. ad Joh. Utenbogard. p. 404.

P. 16.

Bellarmine de Christo l. 2. c. 21. sect. ult.

without that Addition; that the *Greeks* did not begin this *Controverſie* till *A. D.* 600. And how could they poſſibly charge the *Latins* with breaking the *Canons* of the *third Oecumenical*, when, (according to this Opinion) it was added in the *ſecond?* *Petavius* is ſo great a Friend to your Opinion, that in plain terms he calls it *ridiculous*, and abundantly confutes that Imagination of its being inſerted, becauſe of the Hereſie of the ὑιοπατρία, as *Manuel Calecas* calls it, who with *Ariſtinus*, are all thoſe worſhipful Authorities which this Opinion ſtands on. But, ſetting aſide the contrary Authorities to theſe, any one, who is any thing verſed in this Controverſie, muſt needs eſteem this the moſt improbable account that can be given of this Addition. For, if this were true, how little did the *Latins* at the *Council* at *Florence* underſtand their buſineſs; when, if they could have produced ſuch an Addition before the *Epheſine Council*, all the *Greeks* Objections had come to nothing? If this were true, how little did *Leo* 3. conſult his own, or his Predeceſſour's Honour, who diſſwaded the *Legates* of the Council at *Aquiſgrane*, from continuing in the *Creed* that Addition of *Filioque*: For, when after a great deal of diſcourſe concerning the Article and the Addition; the *Legates* at laſt tell him, *That they perceived, his pleaſure was, that it ſhould be taken out of the Creed, and ſo every one left to his liberty. His Anſwer is, So it is certainly determined by me, and I would perſwade you by all means to aſſent to it*: And, to manifeſt this to be his conſtant Judgment, he cauſed the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed, without the Addition of* Filioque *to be inſcribed in a greater Silver Tablet, and placed publickly in the Church, to be read of all, as appears by the Teſtimony of* Photius, *and* Peter Lombard, *that ſo all, both* Greeks *and* Latins, *might ſee, that nothing was added to the Creed.* Had not this now been a ſtrange Action of his, if this Addition had been ſo long before in the time of *Damaſus?* Nothing then can be more evident, than that in this *Leo*'s *Time*, no ſuch Addition was made to the *Creed*: Therefore, it ſeems moſt probable, which the famous *Antoninus* delivers, that this Addition was made by *Pope Nicolaus* 1. For, when he relates the Cauſes, why *Photius* Excommunicated him, he mentions that in the firſt place, *That he had made an Addition to the Creed, by making the Spirit to proceed from the Son; and therefore had fallen under the Sentence of the third Oecumenical Council, which prohibited ſuch Additions to be made.* To which *P. Pithæus* ſubſcribes likewiſe, and *Petavius* ſeems not to diſſent; the only thing which is pretended againſt it, is, that *Andreas Coloſſenſis* in the *Council* at *Ferrara*, ſaith, That though *Photius* was a known and bitter Enemy of the *Latin Church*, yet he never objected this Addition againſt *Nicolaus* or *Adrian*; but how ſtrangely overſeen *Andreas* was in theſe words, ſufficiently appears by *Photius* his *Encyclical Epiſtle*, wherein he doth in Terms object this againſt the *Latins*, as appears by the words already produced. So that although you would willingly have ſet this Addition far enough off from the *Schiſm*, yet you ſee how improbable a Fiction you produce for it; and withal you ſee, that this *Addition*, by the conſent of your own moſt Learned and Impartial Writers, falls juſt upon the time when the *Schiſm* broke out, *viz.* in the time of *Nicolaus* and *Photius*; and therefore, now judge you, whether theſe words were ſo long added before the *Schiſm*, that they could give no occaſion to it.

Petav Dogmat Theol. de Trinit. Tom. 2. l. 7. c. 2.

Ita proculdubio à noſtra parte decernitur; ità quoque, ut à veſtra aſſentiatur, à nobis omnimodis ſuadetur. Apud Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. Tom. 2. p. 256.

Baron. Annal. ad An. 809.

Phot. in ep. ad Patriarch. Aquileienſ. Pet. Lombard. lib. 1. ſent. diſt. 11.

Tunc inter alias accuſationes hoc principaliter poſuit, Ipſum fore excommunicatum, quod appoſuerat ad ſymbolum, Sp. Sanctum à filio procedere. Similiter & depoſitum, quod ipſe Nicolaus Papa incidiſſet in ſententiam tertii Concilii. Anton. Part. 3. Tit. 22. c. 13. ſect. 10.

Concil. Florent. ſeſſ. 8.

2. The

2. The next thing to be considered, is, *Whether they, who added it, had power so to do?* Two things the *Greeks* insist on, to shew, that it was not done by sufficient Authority. 1. *Because all such Additions were directly prohibited by the* Ephesine *Council.* 2. *That supposing them not prohibited, yet the Pope had no power to add to the Creed without the consent of the* Eastern *Churches.*

1. *That such Additions were severely prohibited by the* Ephesine *Council:* The Sanction of which *Council* to this purpose hath been already produced, and is extant both in the *Acts* of the *Ephesine* and *Florentine Councils*, in which latter it is insisted on as the *Foundation* of the *Greeks Arguments* against the Addition of *Filioque*, by *Marcus Ephesius*; and the Reason he there gives of such a Sanction made by the *Council* at *Ephesus*, is, that after the *Nicene Council*, in several *Provincial Councils*, there were above *thirty several Expositions* made of the *Nicene Creed*; upon which, the *second Oecumenical Council* made a further Explication of it, explaining those things which belonged to the *Divinity* of the *Spirit*, and the *Incarnation of Christ*; and, because they did not prohibit any Additions, the *Nestorians* easily depraved the *Nicene Creed*, inserting their own Opinions into it (as appears by the Confession of Faith exhibited to the *Council* by *Charisius*) which being read in the *Council*, and the *Fathers* thereby understanding how easily, after this rate, *New Creeds* might be continually made in the *Church*, they severely prohibited any further Additions to be made to the *Creed.* And therefore, although they Decreed in that *Council* the *Virgin Mary* to be Θεοτόκος, in opposition to *Nestorius*; yet, they never offered to insert it into the *Creed*, although they apprehended it necessary to explain the *Oeconomy* of our *Saviour's Incarnation.* And that which much confirms the meaning of the Decree, to be the absolute prohibition of all kind of Additions to the *Creed*, is, the *Epistle of St. Cyril* of *Alexandria* to *Johannes Antiochenus*, wherein reciting this Decree of the *Council*, he adds these words as the Explication of it. *We neither permit our selves, or others to change one Word or Syllable of what is herein contained* (speaking of the *Nicene Creed*) which Epistle was read and approved in the *fourth Oecumenical Council.* To this the *Latins* answered them, that which is still answered in the same case, *viz. That this Article of* Filioque *was only a Declaration, and not a prohibited Addition:* But the *Greeks* say, this Answer is unsatisfactory on these accounts. 1. Because there is no reason to say, that Decree doth not forbid the inserting *Declarations* into the *Creed.* 2. That if it did not forbid that, yet there is as little reason to say, this was a meer Declaration. 1. Because there is no reason to say, that the *Council* did not forbid the inserting Declarations into the *Creed:* For, as *Bessarion* well observes, it never was lawful to add new and distinct Articles of *Faith*, from those which are contained in Scripture, but the *Church* only undertook the Explication and Declaration of the things therein contained; and this was only lawful. Therefore the *Ancient Fathers* had full liberty of explaining Articles of Faith, and using those Explications, as they judged most expedient, and to place them where they thought good, so it were not in *Scripture:* Thence they might insert them into the *Creed*, or elsewhere. But afterwards (*i. e.* after this Decree of the *Ephesine Council*) this liberty was partly taken away, and partly continued. For it never was, or will be, unlawful to explain or declare Articles of Faith; but to insert those Explications into the *Creed*, is now unlawful, because forbidden by the Decree of a *General Council.* For, saith he, the *Fathers* of the *third Council*, observing what great Inconveniencies had

Concil. Ephes. part. 2. Act. 6. p. 366. Concil. Florent. sess 5. p. 587.

ὅτε μὴν ὀφείλομεν ἑαυτοῖς, ἢ ἑτέροις ἢ λέξιν ἀμεῖψαι τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐκεῖσι, ἢ μίαν γὰρ παραβῆναι συλλαβήν. p. 589. Sess. 5.

Council. Florent. sess. 8. p. 626.

had

had followed in the *Church*, upon the inlargement of *Creeds*, and that no Injury could at all come by the Prohibition of any further Additions to be inſerted (for by that means they ſhould only be bound to believe no more than what thoſe *Holy Fathers* believed; and who dare charge their Faith with Imperfection) and they did therefore wiſely forbid all other Expoſitions of Faith to be inſerted into the *Creed*, as he there at large proves. And in the progreſs of that Diſcourſe, takes off that which *Bellarmine* looked on as the only ſatisfactory Anſwer, *viz. That the Prohibition concerned only private Perſons*; For, ſaith he, it cannot be conceived, that the *Council* ſhould take care about the Declarations of the *Creed*, made by particular Perſons (whereas it always was, and is lawful for ſuch to declare their Faith more particularly, as appears by the *Creed* of *Chariſius*, received in this *Council*) but this they looked after, that the *Creed*, which was commonly received in the *Chriſtian Churches*, and into which Men are Baptized, ſhould receive no alteration at all. And to ſhew what their meaning was, though their *Council* was purpoſely aſſembled againſt *Neſtorius*, yet they would not inſert Θεοτόκος into the *Creed*. And the ſame Decree was obſerved in the 4, 5, 6, 7. *Councils*; which, by their Actions, did declare this to be the meaning of the *Epheſine Council*, that no Declarations whatſoever, ſhould hereafter be inſerted into the *Creed*. For, if they were meer Declarations, there was much leſs neceſſity of inſerting them into the *Creed*, which was ſuppoſed to be a Syſtem of the neceſſary Articles of Faith.

2. *There was as little reaſon to ſay, that this Article was a meer Declaration.* For, the *Latins* pretended, that the Article of *Filioque*, was only a further Explication of that *ex Patre*. For, if ſo, then whoſoever doth believe the Proceſſion from the *Father*, doth believe all that is neceſſary to be believed: And therefore certainly it can be no Hereſie not to believe the Proceſſion from the Son, becauſe that is only ſuppoſed to be a Declaration of that from the Father. And ſince you are ſo ready to charge the *Greek Church* with *Hereſie*, I pray tell us whether this Article be a Declaration or not: If not, then the *Latins* were all deceived, who pleaded the lawfulneſs of inſerting *Filioque* on that account; and conſequently it muſt be a prohibited Addition; If it be, then ſhew us what Hereſie lies in not acknowledging a meer Explication, when all that is ſuppoſed neceſſary is believed in the Subſtance of the Article. Moreover, *Beſſarion* rightly diſtin-
P. 625. guiſheth between an Explication, τῶν ἐγκειμένων, from ἐκ τῶν ἐγκειμένων, and therefore grants that the *Filioque* might be ſaid to be an Explication *of ſomething* contained in the *Creed*, but not *out of any thing* contained in the *Creed*; and therefore the *Medium* being *extrinſecal*, it could not be ſaid to be a meer Declaration. For, there can be no neceſſary Argument drawn from the Proceſſion from the Father, to infer the Proceſſion from the Son; but it muſt be proved from ſome extrinſecal diſtinct Argument.

§. 20. 2. *Suppoſe this to be no prohibited Addition, yet what right had the Pope and his Council, without the conſent of the* Eaſtern *Churches, to make this Addition to the Creed?* For, the *Greeks* ſaid, whatever Authority the *Church* of *Rome* had, is received by the *Canons*, and its Authority was therefore leſs than that of an *Oecumenical Council*, wherefore it could not juſtly repeal, or act contrary to the Decree of a *General Council*, as it did apparently in this caſe. By which means the *Latins* were driven off from thoſe which they looked on as ſlighter Velitations, and took *Sanctuary* in the *Plenitude of the Pope's Power*, that therefore no *Council* could preſcribe to him; there could be no neceſſity of his calling the *Eaſtern Churches* to debate this *Addition*, for he could do it of himſelf, by virtue of his own Authority in and over the Church. Here *Anſelm*

and

and *Bonaventure* think to ſecure themſelves, and hither they are all driven at laſt. So that we plainly ſee, whatever elſe is pretended, *the Pope's Uſurped Power* was that which truly gave occaſion to the *Schiſm:* For, it was not the *Latins* believing the Proceſſion from the Son, which made the ſeparation between the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, but the *Pope's pretending a Power to impoſe an Article of Faith in the Creed againſt the Decree of a former, and without the conſent of a preſent Oecumenical Council.* If you pretend, that there hath been ſince an *Oecumenical Council* at *Florence*, which hath declared it; by that very anſwer you juſtifie the *Greeks* before that *Council*, and ſo lay the guilt of the *Schiſm* wholly on the *Pope*, who did inſert and impoſe this Article, before an *Oecumenical Council.* Thus ſtill it appears, the cauſe of the *Schiſm* began at *Rome*; and by the ſame argument with which you charge them with *Hereſie*, *viz.* the *Council* at *Florence*, you vindicate the *Greek Church* from *Schiſm*, in all the actions of it before that *Council.*

And this might ſuffice to ſhew, that it was not the *Levity, Vanity, or Ambition of the* Greeks, *which gave the great occaſion of the Schiſm, but the Pride, Incroachments, and Uſurpations of the Church of* Rome, as might largely be manifeſted from the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, when the *Schiſm* began. The riſe of which ought to be derived from the times of the *Conſtantinopolitan*, and *Chalcedon Councils*; the *ſecond* and *fourth Oecumenical.* For, the *Canons* of thoſe *Councils decreeing equal Privileges to* Conſtantinople, *with thoſe of* Rome, *made the Popes have a continual jealouſie upon the* Greek *Church*, and watch all opportunities to diſgrace it, and infringe the liberties of it. Thence came the Rage of *Leo* againſt *Anatolius* the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, in the time of *Martianus*; thence the Feud between *Simplicius* and *Felix* 3. of *Rome*, and *Acacius* of *Conſtantinople*, for defending the Privileges of his *See*, in oppoſition to the *Pope's*; inſomuch that *Felix* fairly Excommunicates him, becauſe he would not ſubmit to the *Pope's* Tryal in the caſe of the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*; which continued ſo long, that *Euphemius*, who ſucceeded *Acacius*, though he Excommunicated *Petrus Moggus* of *Alexandria*, yet could not be received into the Communion of the *Roman Church* by *Felix*, becauſe he would not expunge the name of *Acacius* out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*; and afterwards *Gelaſius* refuſed it on the ſame grounds; which *Euphemius* ſtill denying to do, the Schiſm continued. And, although afterwards the *Emperour Anaſtaſius*, and the *Greek Church*, deſired the making up of this Difference; yet no other Terms of Communion would be accepted by *Hormiſdas*, without the expunging the name of *Acacius.* So implacably were they bent againſt the very memory of *Acacius*, for defending the *Privilege* of his *See*, that they would rather continue that lamentable *Schiſm*, than not avenge themſelves upon him; and conſequently, make all future *Patriarchs* fearful of oppoſing the *Pope's Authority.* If we look yet further, we ſhall ſtill find the Ambition of the *Popes* to have cauſed all the Diſturbance in the *Greek Churches*, although ſome of the *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople* cannot be excuſed from the ſame Faults. In the time of the *ſecond Council* at *Nice*, *Pope Adrian* not only contends for the enlargement of his Juriſdiction, but threatens to pronounce them *Hereticks*, who did not conſent to it, which makes *Petrus de Marca* ſay, *That he ſuppoſeth* [*that*] *the firſt time ever any were charged with Hereſie on ſuch an account.* The ſame Pretence we ſtill find in all the *Schiſms* which ever happened, as that in the time of *Photius*, that afterward, in the time of *Michael Cerularius*, and in the ſucceſſive Ages, ſtill the Terms of Communion were, Submiſſion to the *Church of Rome*, and acknowledging the Supremacy of that *See*, which the *Greeks* did then, and do ſtill conſtantly deny; ſo that it was not the *Greeks Levity*, but

Petrus de Marca, de Concord. Sacerd. & Imp. l. 2. c. 1. ſect. 5.

the *Romaniſts* Ambition and Uſurpation which gave occaſion to that fearful *Schiſm.*

§. 21. But for all this, *It muſt ſtill be lawful for your Church to add, and Anathematize too:* Which his Lordſhip thought a little unreaſonable, but it ſeems you do not: For, ſay you, *The Church did rightly Anathematize all ſuch denyers*; why ſo? *Becauſe the meaning of the* Latin *Church being underſtood by the Addition of* Filioque, *and that whoſoever denied, muſt be ſuppoſed to deny the Proceſſion, then it became Hereſie to deny it, and the Church did rightly Anathematize all ſuch denyers.* So you ſay indeed; but, you would do well, 1. To ſhew, that the underſtanding the meaning of the *Latin Church*, is ſufficient to make the denyers of what ſhe affirms, to be *Hereticks.* 2. How any one that denies the *Filioque* muſt be ſuppoſed to deny the Proceſſion. If you mean the Proceſſion *à Filio*, you ſpeak very *wiſely*, but prove nothing; for ſome might grant the Proceſſion, and yet deny the lawfulneſs of your *Churches* adding to the *Creed.* 3. All this while we are to ſeek how the *Latin Church* can make any thing to be a *Hereſie*, which was not ſo before. And therefore if your *Anathema's* have no better grounds, the *Greeks* need not much fear the effects of them. That *your Church on any occaſion is apt enough to ſpeak loud words*, we may very eaſily believe, but whether ſhe had juſt cauſe to ſpeak ſo big in this cauſe, is the thing in queſtion, and we have already manifeſted the contrary.

P. 26. n. 3. His Lordſhip ſays, *It ought to be no eaſie thing, to condemn a Man of Hereſie in foundation of Faith; much leſs a Church; leaſt of all, ſo ample and large a Church as the* Greek, *eſpecially ſo as to make them no Church. Heaven Gates were not ſo eaſily ſhut againſt multitudes, when St.* Peter *wore the Keys at his own*

P. 12. *Girdle.* To this you anſwer; *Neither is the Roman-Catholick Church juſtly accuſable of Cruelty (though the Biſhop taxes her of it) becauſe ſhe is quick and ſharp againſt thoſe that fall into Hereſie.* But, if ſhe hath power to pronounce whom ſhe pleaſe *Hereticks*, and on what account ſhe pleaſe (as *Hadrian* I. in caſe of his *Patrimony*) and then it be commendable in her to deal with them as *Hereticks*, it muſt needs be dangerous oppoſing her in any thing, for ſuch who dread her *Anathema's.* But his Lordſhip was not ſpeaking of what was to be done, in caſe of notorious Hereſie, but what tenderneſs ought to be uſed in condemning Men for *Hereſie*; and much more in condemning whole *Churches* for it, on ſuch ſlender accounts as you do the *Greek Church.* You ſhould ſhew, When St. *Peter*, or any of the *Apoſtles* did exclude *Churches* from Communion, for denying ſuch *Articles* as that you charge the *Greek Church* with. And it would be worth your *enquiry*, why thoſe in the *Corinthian Church*, who at leaſt queſtioned the *Reſurrection*; thoſe in the *Galatian and other Churches*, who aſſerted the *Neceſſity of the Ceremonial Law under the Goſpel*, both which *errours* are by the *Apoſtle* ſaid to be of ſo dangerous a nature; are not *Anathematized* preſently by the *Apoſtle*, and thrown out of the *Church* at leaſt, *to prevent the Infection of other Chriſtians, if not for the good of the Libertine Hereticks*, as you ſpeak. Your mentioning St. *Peter's proceeding with Ananias* and *Sapphira*, muſt be acknowledged a very fit reſemblance for your Churche's dealing with *Hereticks*; only they whom you are pleaſed to account *Hereticks*, have cauſe to rejoyce, that ſince your Churches Good-will is ſo much diſcovered, ſhe hath not the ſame *miraculous Power:* For, then ſhe would be ſure to have few left to oppoſe her. But do you really think, *Ananias* and *Sapphira's* fault was no greater than that of the *Greek Church*, that you produce this Inſtance? And, do you think the Church enjoys ſtill the ſame Power over Offenders, which St. *Peter* then had? If not, to what purpoſe do you mention ſuch things here; unleſs to let us ſee, that it is want of

ſomething

ſomething elſe beſides will, which makes you ſuffer any whom you call *Hereticks* to live. That St. *Paul* chaſtiſeth his untoward *Children*, indeed you tell us, from 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. But if you bring this to any purpoſe, you muſt make the *Greeks Errour*, as bad as *Inceſt*, or a *denying the Faith*; and when you have ſo done, you may hear of a further Anſwer. On what account *your Church puniſheth Delinquents*, will be then neceſſary to be ſhewed, when you have a little further cleared what *Power* your Church hath to make *Delinquents* in ſuch caſes as you condemn the *Greek Church* for. But, as long as your Church is Accuſer, Witneſs, and Judge too, you muſt never expect that your *Anathema's* will be accounted any other than *bruta fulmina*, noiſe, and no more.

CHAP. II.

Of Fundamentals in General.

The Popiſh Tenet concerning Fundamentals, a meer Step to the Roman *Greatneſs. The Queſtion about Fundamentals ſtated. An Enquiry into the Nature of them. What are Fundamentals, in order to particular Perſons; and what to be owned as ſuch, in order to Eccleſiaſtical Communion. The Prudence and Moderation of the Church of* England, *in defining Articles of Faith. What judged Fundamental by the Catholick Church. No new Articles of Faith can become neceſſary. The Churches Power in propounding Matter of Faith, examined. What is a ſufficient Propoſition. Of the Athanaſian Creed, and its being owned by the Church of* England. *In what Senſe the Articles of it are neceſſary to Salvation. Of the diſtinction of the material and formal Object of Faith, as to Fundamentals. His Lordſhip's Integrity, and* T. C's *Forgery, in the Teſtimony of* Scotus. *Of Hereſie, and how far the Church may declare Matters of Faith. The Teſtimony of St.* Auguſtine *vindicated.*

THE *Greek Church* appearing not guilty of *Hereſie*, by any evidence of *Scripture*, Reaſon, or the Conſent of the Primitive Church, nothing is left to make good the Charge, but that the *Church of Rome* hath defin'd it to be ſo; which Pretence, at firſt view, carrying the greateſt Partiality and Unreaſonableneſs in it, great care is taken, that the Partiality be not diſcovered, by not openly mentioning the *Church* of *Rome*, but the *Church in General* (as though it were impoſſible to conceive any other *Church* but that at *Rome*) and for the unreaſonableneſs of it, it muſt be confidently aſſerted, *That all Points defin'd by the Church are fundamental:* So to be ſure the *Greek Church* will never eſcape the Charge of *Hereſie*. For this end, Mr. *Fiſher in the Conference acknowledgeth, that when his Lordſhip had denied the Errour of the* Greek *Church to be Fundamental, he was forced to repeat what he had formerly brought againſt Dr.* White, *concerning Points Fundamental.* The reaſon of which was, that, eaſily perceiving that it was impoſſible to ſtand their Ground in the Charge on the *Greek Church* upon other Terms, he is forced to take *Sanctuary* in the *Churches Definition*; and if that will not make it good, there is nothing elſe remaining to do it. And this is the cauſe of the following *Diſpute concerning Fundamentals*; wherein the main thing undertaken, is, the Proof, that the formal Reaſon of *Fundamentals* is to be taken from the *Definition of the preſent Church*; but, as this muſt be confeſſed to be the main Fundamental of the *Church* of *Rome*, (for which yet the thing being manifeſt, no *Definition* of that *Church* is neceſſary;) ſo withal, I doubt not, but it will be made evident in the progreſs of this Diſ- §. 1.

courſe, that never was there any Pretence more Partial, Abſurd, and Tyrannical than this is.* Which his Lordſhip takes notice of in theſe words, which deſerve a Repetition; *It was not the leaſt means by which* Rome *grew to her Greatneſs, to blaſt every oppoſer ſhe had with the name of Heretick or Schiſmatick; for this ſerved to ſhrivel the Credit of the Perſons. And the Perſons once brought into Contempt and Ignominy, all the Good they deſired in the Church, fell to Duſt, for want of creditable Perſons to back and ſupport it. To make this proceeding good, in theſe latter Years, this courſe, it ſeems, was taken. The School that muſt maintain (and ſo they do) that all Points defin'd by the Church, are thereby Fundamental, neceſſary to be believed, of the Subſtance of Faith; and that, though it be determined quite* extra Scripturam. *And then leave the wiſe and active Heads to take order, that there be ſtrength enough ready to determine what is fitteſt for them.* To this you anſwer, with an ὦ κατάρατε! You call it *a Squib, a Fancy, a weak Diſcourſe, one of the Biſhop's Railleries,* and what not. It ſeems it pinched you hard, you cry out ſo Tragically. But it is very certain, you are more impatient to have your Politicks, than your Errours diſcovered; and if you have any Curſes more dreadful than others, they are ſure to light on thoſe who diſcover the Intrigues of your Deſigns. For if once Men come to diſcern how much more of Artifice and Cunning, than of Truth and Religion, there is in the managing the Intereſt of your Church, they would not eaſily think, the way to Heaven can lie among ſo many foldings of the old Serpent. And this is not to think as you tragically ſpeak, *That all the World is turn'd Mad or Heathen:* For, thanks be to God, as *Catholick* as your Church is, it muſt be a huge *Catachreſis* to take it for all the World: Neither do we think your Church mad, but very wiſe and *Politick* in theſe Pretences; and that ſtill you are reſolved to ſhew, that though other *Churches* may be more *Children of Light than yours* (ignorance being ſo much in favour with you) yet *yours is wiſer in its Generation.* But how the pretending of your Church to Infallibility, and power to define Fundamentals, ſhould make us imagine *all the World Heathen*, is not eaſie to conceive, unleſs you are conſcious to your ſelf, that ſuch Pretences as theſe are, are the way to make it ſo. But we muſt ſee ſtill how your *Cothurnus* fits you. *No Truth left upon Earth, but all become Juglers?* See what it is to be true Catholicks, that if they juggle, all the World muſt do ſo too; as though *totus mundus exercet hiſtrioniam*, were *Latin* for the *Infallibility of the Church* of Rome. But have you indeed ſuch a *Monopoly* of Truth, that if your Party prove Juglers, there will be no Truth left upon Earth? If you had ſaid, none unſophiſticated, yet even that had been a great *Truth* left upon Earth ſtill. But I ſhall cut you ſhort in what follows of your Declamation, by telling you, that though your Harangue were ten times longer than it is, and your Exclamations louder, and your Authorities better than of *your Prelates, Miracles, Doctors, Heads of Schools, Auſtere and Religious Perſons* (in *Engliſh* Monks and Friars) yet all theſe would not one jot perſwade us contrary to common Senſe, and the large Experience of the World, That *Religion* is not made by you an Inſtrument to advance the *Pope's Ambition*, and that the *Church* is but a more plauſible Name, whereby to maintain the *Court of Rome.* And we need not go from our preſent Subject, for a Proof of it. I will not charge this upon all Perſons of your Communion, for all of them do not believe the State-principles of your Church; and others are kept, as much as may be, from all ways of diſcovering the great Deſigns of it; and therefore there may be ſo much Innocency and Simplicity in ſome, as may keep them from *proſtituting their Salvation to the Pope's Greatneſs:* But this is no Plea on behalf

of

* P. 27. Sect. 10. n. 2.

P. 13. n. 1.

of thoſe who have the Managery of thoſe Deſigns; who, if they do not ſee what things are fitteſt for the *Pope's* temporal Ends, will not long be thought fit for their Employment. But, is it not palpable how much you endeavour to ſhrivel Chriſtianity into a Party and Faction, excluding all others that are not of your Party out of the Church, and conſequently from hopes of Salvation, though never ſo Pious and Conſcientious? Are not the far greateſt part of the Opinions you contend for, againſt all the reſt of the Chriſtian World, ſuch as are manifeſtly ſubſervient to temporal Ends? And are not ſuch more zealouſly diſputed for, than the plain Articles of Faith, and the indiſpenſible Precepts of the Chriſtian Religion? Have you not found out all the Artifices imaginable, to enervate the Force of Chriſtian Piety, by your Doctrines about *Repentance*, *Prayer*, *Indulgences*, *Probability*, *Purgatory*, and ſuch like? And inſtead of thoſe rational Acts of *Devotion*, which our *Religion* requires from us, have made choice of ſuch fond, ludicrous, unintelligible pieces of Devotion (by the moſt who are concerned in them) as though you were reſolved to ſee how much it was poſſible to *debauch Chriſtianity*, and make it contemptible in the World? Add to theſe the Arts you have to violate Humane Societies, by diſpenſing with Oaths, breaking Faith, diſſolving Obedience to Civil Authority, when it oppoſeth your Deſigns; and is it poſſible then for Perſons not blind-folded with the groſſeſt ſort of implicit Faith, to judge otherwiſe, but the deſign of your Church, is to determine, *not what is trueſt, but what is fitteſt for your ends?* And, although you ſcurrilouſly call his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, *ſtuff that might ſerve ſometimes for Pulpit-babble, to deceive the giddy Multitude, and caſt a Miſt before their Eyes*; yet you ſee, he was not afraid of what any Adverſary could ſay againſt it, by writing it in a Polemical Diſcourſe, in which we could be glad to ſee ſome of thoſe famous *Legends*, and Seraphical Notions, which your Pulpit-entertainments conſiſt ſo much of, eſpecially where you are out of the reach of Hereticks, and then we ſhould judge which looks more like babling, and deceiving the giddy Multitude. But, to let us ſee what Men of reach and Politicians you are, you have found out a ſtrange *Fetch* in his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, P. 13. *viz.* That all this is, *That they might not ſee the Impurity of their own* Engliſh *Proteſtant Church, even in its firſt riſe under* Henry *the Eighth, and the People cheating Policies it was beholding to for its Reſtauration under* Queen Elizabeth, *as may be ſeen in Hiſtory.* Hiſtory is a large *Wood* to bid us ſeek for theſe cheating *Policies* in; and if you had any other deſign, but meerly to ſhew your ſelf a *Politician* in this, that you can *fortiter calumniari, uſe your Tongue Manfully when Reproaches are uſeful*; you would have produced ſome evidence ſo clear of them, as his Lordſhip here inſiſts on in reference to your Church. But, as long as you converſe only in *Generals*, you will give us leave to think who thoſe are which uſe to do ſo, *viz. ſuch grand Politicians* as your ſelf. For the Particulars of our Reformation, we ſhall have occaſion to vindicate them in another place, and therein ſhall eaſily manifeſt what an *Itch* you had to calumniate here, though you were ſure to *ſmart* for it afterwards. That which you call Weakneſs of Judgment, or want of Charity in his Lordſhip, will be found to lie at another door, by our making it appear, that what you call a groundleſs and impoſſible Slander, is a real and undoubted Truth. But when you tell us, That *ſuch Railleries do not become one that would be eſteemed a grave Doctor of the* Engliſh *Church, an* alterius orbis Patriarcha, *as the ancient Primates of* England *have been call'd:* P. 14. I know not whether you diſcover more judgment, or reading in it; *your judgment* in calling that an unbecoming *Raillery*, which is a great and ſeaſonable

Truth;

Truth; *your reading*, in miſtaking *Patriarcha* for *Papa*, or elſe you were willing to diſſemble it, becauſe then by the advantage of this *Title*, he might be fitter to diſcover the Artifices and Deſigns of his *Fellow-Pope*. The laying open of which is certainly vaſtly different from *ſporting with all that can be ſerious on Earth* (*Man's Salvation*) as you moſt injuriouſly calumniate his Lordſhip in your next words, in affirming ſo of him, when his only deſign was, to clear the way to Man's Salvation, by diſcovering the Gins and Traps which are laid in the way of ſilly Men, by the pernicious ſubtilty of thoſe of your Party.

§. 2. The way being thus cleared, we come to the main Queſtion, *viz*, *Whether all Points, defined by the Church, are Fundamentals*; and here, becauſe you tell us, *His Lordſhip is like one* that provides for a *Retreat or a Subterfuge, by cutting out a number of ambiguous diſtinctions*; you give us fair hopes what clear Proceedings we may expect from you, who abhor as much the clear ſtating of a queſtion, as *Foxes* do running in beaten Roads. But, as well as you love *them*, you muſt be drawn out of your *Holes*, which will be much for the advantage of Truth, though very little for yours. To come therefore cloſe to the Buſineſs, that you may not think I ſeek Subterfuges, or Retreats, I ſhall wave all other Acceptions of *Fundamentals*, and take the Queſtion in your own ſenſe, that is, *for Points neceſſary to Salvation*. The Queſtion then in Controverſie between us, is this, *Whether the Ground or Reaſon why any thing is fundamental or neceſſary to Salvation, be, becauſe it is defined by the Church to be ſo*, and conſequently, *Whether all Points, defined by the Church, be not fundamental or neceſſary to Salvation?* For the occaſion of this Controverſie was from the *Greek Church*, whether her Errour, as to the Proceſſion from the *Son*, be fundamental or no, *i. e.* ſuch as excludes her from being a *Church*, and conſequently from Salvation. The ground of your Affirmation, is, becauſe *the Church had defined it to be ſo*; ſo that the Ground and Reaſon why any thing is ſuppoſed fundamental or neceſſary to Salvation, muſt be the Definition of the Church: But for our

P. 15. better underſtanding your meaning, *you diſtinguiſh of two ways, whereby Points may be neceſſary to Salvation; the one abſolutely, by reaſon of the matter they contain; which*, ſay you, *is ſo fundamentally neceſſary in it ſelf, that not only the disbelief of it, when propounded by the Church, but the meer want of an expreſs knowledge, and belief of it, will hinder Salvation; and thoſe are ſuch Points, without the expreſs belief whereof, no Man can be ſaved, which Divines call neceſſary* neceſſitate medii; *others of this kind they call neceſſary* neceſſitate præcepti, *which all Men are commanded to ſeek after, and expreſly believe; ſo that a culpable Ignorance of them hinders Salvation, although ſome may be ſaved with invincible Ignorance of them. And all theſe are abſolutely neceſſary to be expreſly believed, either* neceſſitate præcepti, *or* medii, *in regard of the matter which they contain. But the reſt of the Points of Faith are neceſſary to be believed* neceſſitate præcepti, *only conditionally, that is, to all ſuch to whom they are ſufficiently propounded, as defined by the Church: Which neceſſity proceeds not preciſely from the material Object, or Matter contained in them; but from the formal Object of Divine Authority, declared to Chriſtians by the Churches Definition. Whether therefore the Points in queſtion be neceſſary in the firſt manner or no, by reaſon of their preciſe matter; yet if they be neceſſary, by reaſon of the Divine Authority, or formal Object of Divine Revelation, ſufficiently declared and propounded to us, they will be Points Fundamental, that is, neceſſary to Salvation to be believed, as we have ſhewed Fundamental muſt here be taken.* Theſe words of yours containing the full ſtate of the Queſtion in your own Terms, and being the ſubſtance of all you ſay on this Controverſie, I have recited at large; that you may not complain, your meaning is miſtaken in them. You aſſert then,

that

that beſides that *Neceſſity* which ariſeth from the *Matter* of things to be believed, and from the abſolute *Command* of God; there is another neceſſity *conditionally* upon the *Churches Definition*, but, ſuppoſing that *Definition*, the thing ſo propounded becomes as neceſſary to Salvation, as what is neceſſary from the matter; for in all Hypothetical Propoſitions, the Suppoſition being in act, the Matter becomes neceſſary. For, unleſs you ſpeak of ſuch a neceſſity, as becomes as univerſally obligatory, on ſuppoſition of the Churches Definition, as that which ariſeth from the Matter, or abſolute Command; you are guilty of the greateſt Tergiverſation, and perverting the ſtate of the Queſtion. For, otherwiſe that cannot be ſaid to be fundamental or neceſſary to Salvation, in the ſenſe of this Queſtion, which is not generally neceſſary to Salvation to all Chriſtians. For no Man was ever ſo ſilly, as to imagine, that the Queſtion of *Fundamentals*, with reſpect to whole *Churches*, as it is here taken, can be underſtood in any other ſenſe, than as the matter, call'd *Fundamental* or *Neceſſary*, muſt be equally fundamental and neceſſary to all Perſons. And that this muſt be your meaning, appears by the riſe of the Controverſie, which concerns the whole *Greek Church*, which you exclude from being a *Church*, becauſe ſhe errs fundamentally, and that ſhe errs fundamentally, becauſe the *Church* hath defined it to be an Errour. So that what the *Church* determines as Matter of Faith, is as neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation, as that which is neceſſary from the Matter, or from an abſolute Command. For, otherwiſe the *Greek Church* might not be in a *Fundamental Errour*, notwithſtanding the *Churches Definition:* The ground of this *Errour* being *Fundamental*, not being derived from the Matter, or abſolute Command, but from the *Churches Definition.* If therefore the denial of what the Church defines, doth exclude from Salvation; the neceſſity and obligation muſt be equal to that which ariſeth from the Matter to be believed. And if the Church defines any particulars to be explicitly believed as neceſſary to Salvation, not only the *not disbelieving* them, but the *not explicit believing them*, will be as deſtructive to Salvation, as if the matter of the things themſelves were neceſſary; or that it were abſolutely commanded; for in thoſe caſes, you ſay, the not explicit believing is that which damns, and ſo on your Principles it will do here, when the explicit Belief is the thing defined by the Church. This will be more plain by an Inſtance. It is notoriouſly known, that at the ſhutting up of the *Council* of *Trent*, a *Confeſſion of Faith* was drawn up, and confirmed by the *Bull* of *Pius* 4. *A. D.* 1564. and that, *ut unius & ejuſdem fidei profeſſio uniformiter ab omnibus exhibeatur, That the Profeſſion of one and the ſame Faith, may be made known to all, and declared uniformly by all.* In which Confeſſion, after the enumeration of the *Articles* contained in the *Ancient Creed*; there are many others added concerning *Traditions*, *Seven Sacraments*, the *Decrees of the Council of* Trent, *as to original Sin and Juſtification*; *The Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Communion in one kind*, *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Worſhip of Images*, *Indulgences*, *the Pope's Supremacy*, &c. All which are required to be believed with an equal aſſent to the former, as *abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation*, and neceſſary Conditions of *Catholick Communion.* For thus it ends; *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt, quam in præſenti ſponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam uſque ad extremum vitæ ſpiritum*, &c. *This true Catholick Faith, without which none can be ſaved, which at preſent I profeſs, and truly hold, and will do whole and undefiled to my lives end, &c.* Judge you now, whether an equal explicit Faith be not here

required

required to the Definitions of the Church, as to the Articles of the Creed; and if so, there must be an equal necessity, in order to Salvation, of believing both of them, it being here so expressly declared, that these Definitions are *Integral Parts* of that *Catholick Faith*, without which there is *no Salvation*. And what could be more said of those things, whose matter, or absolute Precept do make them necessary? This Confession of Faith therefore gives us the truest state of the present Question, in these Particulars. 1. That the *Definitions* of the Church are to be believed, to be as necessary to Salvation, as the Articles of the *Ancient Creed*, without the belief of which no Salvation is to be expected. 2. That the *explicit Belief* of these Definitions as necessary to Salvation, may be required in order to *Catholick Communion*, and that they are to be believed of all as such, *because* they are defined by the *Church*. So that the Question is not, *What is so required by the Churches Definition, declared and propounded to us, that it ought not to be disbelieved without mortal and damnable Sin, which unrepented destroys Salvation*, as you stated it; for this seems only to respect the Faith of particular Persons, who are to believe according as the *Proposition* may be judged *sufficient*: But the true state of the Question, is, Whether any *Definitions* of the *Church* may be believed as *Necessary Articles of Faith*; and whether *they may be imposed on others to be believed as such*, so that they may be excluded *Catholick Communion* if they do not. For this is really the true state of the Question, between your Church and ours, ever since the *Council* of *Trent*; and as to it thus stated (as it ought to be) I do most readily joyn issue with you.

5. 3. For the clearing of which important *Question*, on which the main cause of our being separated from your Communion depends, these three things will be necessary to be exactly discussed. 1. *What the Grounds are on which any thing doth become necessary to Salvation?* 2. *Whether any thing, whose matter is not necessary, and is not required by an absolute Command, can by any means whatsoever afterwards become necessary?* 3. *Whether the Church hath power by any Proposition or Definition to make any thing become necessary to Salvation, and to be believed as such, which was not so before?* These three I suppose you cannot deny, but will take in all that is considerable in this Controversie. Which I shall with the more care examine, because nothing tends more to the Peace of the Christian World, than a through and clear discussion of it; and nothing causeth more the *Schisms* and *Divisions* of it, than the want of a right and due Conception of it.

1. *What the Grounds are on which any thing doth become necessary to Salvation?* For our better understandind of which, we must consider two things. 1. *What things are necessary to the Salvation of Men as such, or considered in their single and private Capacities?* 2. *What things are necessary to be owned in order to Salvation, by Christian Societies, or as the Bonds and Conditions of Ecclesiastical Communion?* The want of understanding this distinction of the necessity of things, hath caused most of the Perplexities and Confusion in this Controversie of *Fundamentals*.

1. *What those things are which are necessary to the Salvation of particular Persons?* But that we may make all as clear as possible, in a matter of so great intricacy, two things again must be enquired into. 1. *What the Ground is, why any thing becomes necessary to be believed in order to Salvation?* 2. *What the Measure and Extent is of those things which are to be believed by particular Persons as necessary to Salvation?*

1. *What the Ground or Foundation is, on which things become necessary to be believed by particular Persons?* And that which is the true ground of the necessity, why any thing is to be believed, is the proper *ratio* of a Fundamental

mental Article. For, I ſuppoſe it a much clearer notion of *Fundamentals*, to underſtand them, not as *Principles*, from whence Deductions may be drawn of *Theological Truths*; but in regard of that immediate reſpect which they have to Men's Salvation. Thoſe things therefore which are neceſſary to be explicitly believed by particular Perſons, are *Fundamentals* in order to their Salvation. Now all belief in this caſe ſuppoſing Divine *Revelation*, nothing can be imagined to be neceſſary to be believed, but what may be certainly known to be of *Divine Revelation*. But when we conſider, that beſides the general Reaſon of believing what God hath Revealed; we muſt either ſuppoſe, that all things are of equal neceſſity, which are revealed in order to the general End of this *Revelation*; or, that ſome things therein contained, are expreſly neceſſary to the End, and other things to be believed on the general account of Faith, ſo far as they are known to be of *Divine Revelation*. Now from hence ariſeth a twofold neceſſity of things to be believed; the firſt more general and large, the ſecond more particular and abſolute. The firſt depends upon the *formal Reaſon* of Faith; the ſecond, on the particular *End* of *Divine Revelation*. That which depends on the *formal Reaſon* of that *Aſſent* we call *Faith*, is that which ſuppoſeth *Divine Veracity*, or the impoſſibility of God's deceiving us in any thing revealed by Him; now this extends to all things whatſoever, which are ſuppoſed by Men to be of *Divine Revelation*. For, though Men may miſtake in the matter, yet the Reaſon of Aſſent holding, under that Miſtake, they are bound neceſſarily to believe whatever is ſuppoſed by them to be *Divine Revelation*. Here lies no difficulty in the ground of Faith, but all the care is to be uſed in the ſearch into the matters which are to be believed on the account of this *Revelation*. But here we are to conſider, that the only thing which is in general, and abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, is the general Act of Faith, *viz. Believing whatever God reveals to be true*, elſe God's Veracity would be call'd in queſtion; but particular Objects cannot be ſaid, on this account, to be abſolutely and univerſally neceſſary, but only ſo far as there are ſufficient Convictions, that thoſe particulars are of Divine Revelation. And, the more general and extenſive the Means of Conviction are, the more large and univerſal is the Obligation to Faith. As, that the *Scriptures* contain in them the *Word* of *God*, is a Matter of more univerſal Obligation, than particular things therein revealed; becauſe the belief of the one depends upon the acknowledgment of the other. And withal, ſuppoſing it believed, that the Matters contained in *Scripture* are of *Divine Revelation*; yet all things are not *equally clear to all Capacities*, that they are therein contained. Which is a ſufficient Ground for us, to ſay, It was not *God's Intention*, that all things contained in his Word, ſhould be believed with the ſame degree of neceſſity by all Perſons. And therefore, though the general Reaſon of Faith depends on *God's Veracity*, yet the particular obligation to the belief of particular things, as revealed by God, depends on the *Means*, whereby we may be aſſured, that ſuch things are revealed by him: Which Means admitting of ſo great *Variety*, as to the Circumſtances and Capacities of particular Perſons, there can be no general *Rule* ſet down what things are neceſſary to be believed by all particular Perſons. For, thoſe who have greater means of knowledge, a larger capacity, and clearer propoſal, are bound to believe more things explicitly, than thoſe who want all theſe, or have a lower degree of them. In which caſe, it is an unreaſonable thing to ſay, that ſuch a one, who disbelieves any thing propounded to him as a Matter

of Faith, doth presently call in question *God's Veracity*; for he may as firmly believe that as any in general, and yet may have ground to question whether *God's Veracity* be at all *concerned* in that which is propounded to him as a Matter of Faith; because he sees no reason to believe that this was
P. 15. ever *revealed by God.* And, by this, a clear answer is given to that *Question*, which you propose: *Whether all those Truths which are sufficiently proposed to any Christian, as defined by the Church for Matter of Faith, can be dis-believed by such a Christian, without mortal and damnable sin, which unrepented destroys Salvation?* To which the Answer is easie upon the grounds here assigned: For this Question concerning particular Persons, and particular Objects of Faith, the Resolution of it doth depend upon the *sufficiency* of the *means*, to convince such a Person, that whatever is propounded as Defined by the Church for a Matter of Faith, is certainly and truly so. For to instance in any one of those new Articles of Faith, *Transubstantiation*, or the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. you tell me, These are necessary to be believed, or at least cannot be dis-believed without sin (which is all one in this case, supposing clear conviction, for then what cannot be dis-believed without Sin, must be explicitly believed.) I desire to know the *Grounds* why they may not? You tell me, These are Truths which are sufficiently proposed to me, as defined by the Church for Matters of Faith. I deny the Churches Proposition to be sufficient to convince me, that these are Matters of Faith; for I understand not what Power your *Church* hath to *define* any thing for *Matter of Faith:* If I granted that, I must understand what you mean by *sufficient Proposition*; whether that your *Church* hath so defined them, or that she hath power so to define them; and because I am heartily willing to believe any thing that I have reason to believe is a Matter of Faith; certainly it can be no Sin in me, not to believe that which I can see no ground at all to believe, either in it self, or because of your *Churches Definition.* And all this while, I have as *high* thoughts of *God's Veracity*, as you can have, and it may be *higher*; because I *Interest* it not in the *false* and *contradictory Definitions* of your *Church.* If therefore you will prove it to be a damnable Sin not to believe whatever is proposed by your *Church* for a Matter of Faith, you must first prove, that there is as universal an Obligation to believe whatever is *sufficiently proposed* as defined by the *Church* for Matter of Faith, as there is to assent to whatever *God reveals as true.* And when you have done this, I will give you leave to state the Question as you do: For then you would offer something to the proof of it, which now you do not. The substance then of what concerns the obligation to Faith, as to particular Objects, on the account of *Divine Revelation*, lies in the *Means* of *Conviction* concerning those particular Objects being divinely revealed, which being various, the *degrees* of *Assent* must be various too: But yet so that the more Men are negligent of the Means of Conviction, the more culpable their Unbelief is; but where Men use all moral diligence to understand what is revealed, and what not, if they cannot be convinced, that some particular thing is of Divine Revelation; it is hard to prove them guilty of mortal and damnable Sin, without first proving, that *God* absolutely requires from Men an *Assent* to that, which it is *impossible* in their *Circumstances* they should believe. And this is the *first sort* of things necessary to be believed by particular Persons; *such as are believed on the general account of God's Veracity in revealing them.*

§. 4. But because there must be a more particular Reason assigned of any such intention in *God* to reveal his Mind to the World, *viz. some peculiar end* which he had in it; therefore a further degree of the necessity of things

to

to be believed, muſt be enquired after, *viz.* ſuch as have an immediate and neceſſary reſpect to the Proſecution of that End. Now the only End aſſignable of that great expreſſion of *Divine Goodneſs*, in declaring to Man the *Will of God*, is the *Eternal Welfare* and *Happineſs* of Mankind, for nothing elſe can be imagined ſuitable and proportionable to the *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs* of *God*; beſides that, this is expreſly mentioned in *Scripture* as God's great End in it. Now this being the great End of Divine Revelation, the neceſſity of things to be believed abſolutely, and in themſelves, muſt be taken from the reference or reſpect which they have to the attainment of this End. And, although the diſtinction be commonly received, of *neceſſity of the Means*, and *of the Command*, as importing a *different kind of neceſſity*, yet in the ſenſe I here take Neceſſity in, the Members of that diſtinction do to me ſeem *coincident*. For I cannot ſee any reaſon to believe that *God* ſhould make the *belief* of any thing *neceſſary*, by an *abſolute Command*, but what hath an immediate tendency by way of *means*, for the *attainment* of this *End*: For otherwiſe, that which is called the *Neceſſity of Precept*, falls under the former degree of *Neceſſity*, *viz.* That which is to be believed on the general account of Divine Revelation. And, although theſe things which are neceſſary, as *Means*, are to be believed on the ſame *formal Reaſon* of Faith; yet ſince *God* had a different *End* in the Revelation of theſe from the other, therefore there is a neceſſity of putting a difference between them. For, ſuppoſing *God* to have ſuch a deſign to bring the Souls of Men to Happineſs; in order to this End ſome Means muſt be *neceſſary*, and theſe muſt conſequently be revealed to Men, becauſe they are ſo neceſſary in order to ſuch an End; now it is apparent, All things contained in *Scripture*, are not of that nature; ſome being at ſo great a remove from this End, that the only reaſon of believing them, is, becauſe they are contained in that Book, which we have the greateſt reaſon to believe, contains nothing falſe in it. Now the only way whereby we may judge of the nature of theſe things, is, from the conſideration of what is made the moſt neceſſary Condition in order to Happineſs; and the way by which we may come to it. And nothing being more evident, than that the *Goſpel* contains in it a *Covenant of Grace*, or the Conditions on which our Salvation depends; whatever is neceſſary in order to our performance of the Conditions required of us, muſt be neceſſary to be believed by all. The *Goſpel* therefore tendring Happineſs upon the Conditions of our *believing in Chriſt*, *and walking in him*; theſe two things are indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation (where the *Goſpel* is known, for we have no reaſon to enquire into the Method of *God's proceeding* with others?) *An hearty Aſſent to the Doctrine of Chriſt*, and *a conſcientious walking according to the Precepts of it*. But to undertake to define *what parts* of that Doctrine *are neceſſary* to Salvation, and *what not*, ſeems to me wholly unneceſſary; becauſe the *Aſſent* to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, as revealed *from God*, muſt neceſſarily carry in it ſo much as is ſufficient in order to Salvation. Whatever therefore is neceſſary to a *Spiritual Life*, is neceſſary abſolutely to Salvation, and no more; but what, and how much that is, muſt be gathered by every one as to himſelf from *Scripture*; but is impoſſible to be defined by others, as to all Perſons. But in all, *Faith towards God, and in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; *and Repentance from dead Works*, are abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation, which imply in them, both an univerſal readineſs of mind to believe and obey God in all things: And by this we ſee, what the Rule and Meaſure of the neceſſity of things to be believed is, as to particular Perſons; which lies in theſe things.

1. *Whatever God hath revealed, is undoubtedly and infallibly true.*

2. *Whatever appears to me, upon ſufficient enquiry, to be revealed by God, I am bound to believe it by virtue of God's Veracity.*

3. *All things not equally appearing to all Perſons to be revealed of God, the ſame meaſure of neceſſity cannot be extended to all Perſons.*

4. *An univerſal Aſſent to the Will of God, and univerſal Obedience to it, are abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to all Perſons, to whom God's Word is revealed.*

Thus much may ſuffice concerning what is neceſſary to be believed by particular Perſons, conſidered as ſuch.

§. 5. But this Controverſie never need break *Chriſtian Societies* in that ſenſe, but the great difficulty lies in the other part of it, which is moſt commonly ſtrangely confounded with the former, *viz. What things are neceſſary to be owned, in order to Church Societies, or Eccleſiaſtical Communion?* For which, we muſt conſider, that the Combination of *Chriſtian Societies*, or that which we call the *Catholick Church*, doth ſubſiſt upon the *belief* of what is neceſſary to Salvation. For the very notion of a *Chriſtian Church* doth imply the belief of all thoſe things, which are neceſſary in order to the end of *Chriſtian Religion*, which is Men's Eternal Happineſs. From whence three things muſt be taken notice of.

1. *That the very Being of a Church, doth ſuppoſe the neceſſity of what is required to be believed in order to Salvation.* For elſe there could not be ſuch a thing as a *Church* imagined, which is only a Combination of Men together, upon the belief of ſuch a Doctrine as neceſſary to Salvation; and for the performance of thoſe Acts of Worſhip which are ſuitable thereto: Therefore to aſſert the *Church* to have power to make things neceſſary to Salvation, is not only abſurd, but deſtructive to the *Being* of that *Church*. For when it offered to define any thing to be neceſſary, which was not ſo before, was it a *Church* or no? If it was a *Church*, it believed all things neceſſary: If it believed *all things* neceſſary, before it *defined*; how comes it to make *more things* neceſſary by its *Definition?* But of this more afterwards.

2. *Whatever Church owns thoſe things which are antecedently neceſſary to the Being of a Church, cannot ſo long ceaſe to be a true Church.* Becauſe it retains that which is the Foundation of the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*. Here we muſt diſtinguiſh thoſe things in the *Catholick Church*, which give its *Being*, from thoſe things which are the proper *Acts* of it, as the *Catholick Church*. As to this latter, the ſolemn Worſhip of God in the way preſcribed by him, is neceſſary; in order to which there muſt be ſuppoſed lawful *Officers* ſet in the *Church*, and *Sacraments* duly adminiſtred: But theſe, I ſay, are rather the *Exerciſe* of the *Communion* of the Catholick Church, than that which gives its *Being*, which is, the belief of that *Religion* whereon its *Subſiſtence* and *Unity* depends; and as long as a Church retains this, it keeps its Being, though the *Integrity* and *Perfection* of it depends upon the due exerciſe of all Acts of Comunion in it.

3. *The Union of the Catholick Church depends upon the Agreement of it, in making the Foundations of its Being, to be the grounds of its Communion.* For the *Unity* being intended to preſerve the *Being*, there can be no reaſon given, why the Bonds of *Union* ſhould extend beyond the *Foundation* of its Being, which is, the owning the things neceſſary to the *Salvation* of all. From whence it neceſſarily follows, that whatſoever *Church* impoſeth the belief of other things *as neceſſary to Salvation*, which were not ſo antecedently neceſſary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*, doth, as much as in it lies, break the *Unity* of it; and thoſe *Churches*, who deſire to preſerve its

Unity,

Unity, are bound thereby not to have Communion with it ſo long as it doth ſo. Of what great Conſequence theſe Principles are to the true underſtanding the diſtance between our Church and yours, if you *ſee* not now, you may *feel* afterwards.

§. 6. Theſe things being premiſed, I come to that which is the main Subject of the preſent Diſpute, which is, *What thoſe things are which ought to be owned by all Chriſtian Societies as neceſſary to Salvation, on which the Being of the Catholick Church depends.* If we can find any ſure footing for the *Definition* of theſe, we ſhall thereby find what the neceſſary Conditions of *Eccleſiaſtical Communion* are, and conſequently where the proper cauſe of *Schiſm* lies in tranſgreſſing thoſe Bounds, and what Foundations may be laid for the Peace of the Chriſtian World. Which being of ſo vaſt importance, would require a larger diſcuſſion, than this place will admit of: But ſo far as is pertinent to our preſent Subject, I ſhall enquire into it; and give an account of my Thoughts, in theſe Propoſitions.

1. *Nothing ought to be owned as neceſſary to Salvation by Chriſtian Societies, but ſuch things, which, by the judgment of all thoſe Societies, are antecedently neceſſary to the Being of the Catholick Church.* For, no reaſon can be aſſigned (as I ſaid before) why the *Bonds* of Union ſhould be extended beyond that which is the *Churches Foundation*; neither can there any reaſon be given why any thing elſe ſhould be judged neceſſary to the *Churches Communion*, but what all thoſe *Churches* (who do not manifeſtly diſſent from the Catholick Church of the firſt Ages) are agreed in, as neceſſary to be believed by all; this will be further explained afterwards. Only I add here, when I ſpeak of the neceſſary Conditions of *Eccleſiaſtical Communion*, I ſpeak of ſuch things which muſt be owned as *neceſſary Articles of Faith*, and not of any other *Agreements* for the *Churches Peace*. I deny not therefore, but that in caſe of great *Diviſions* in the *Chriſtian World*, and any *National Churches reforming it ſelf*, that *Church* may declare its ſenſe of thoſe Abuſes in *Articles of Religion*, and require of Men a *Subſcription* to them; but then we are to conſider, that there is a great deal of difference between the owning ſome Propoſitions in order to Peace, and the believing of them as neceſſary Articles of Faith. And this is clearly the ſtate of the Difference between the *Church* of *Rome*, and the *Church* of *England*. The *Church* of *Rome* impoſeth new *Articles* of *Faith* to be believed as *neceſſary to Salvation*; as appears by the formerly cited *Bull* of *Pius* 4. Which Articles contain in them the Juſtification of thoſe things which are moſt excepted againſt by other *Churches*, and by her impoſing theſe as the Conditions of her Communion, ſhe makes it neceſſary for other *Churches*, who would preſerve the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* upon her true *Foundations*, to forbear her Communion. But the *Church* of *England* makes no *Articles* of *Faith*, but ſuch as have the *Teſtimony* and *Approbation* of the whole Chriſtian World of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by *Rome* it ſelf, and in other things ſhe requires *Subſcription* to them not as *Articles of Faith*, but as *Inferiour Truths*, which ſhe expects a ſubmiſſion to, in order to her Peace and Tranquility. So the late Learned L. *Primate* of *Ireland* often expreſſeth the ſenſe of the *Church* of *England*, as to her *thirty nine Articles*. *Neither doth the Church of* England, ſaith he, *define any of theſe Queſtions, as neceſſary to be believed, either* neceſſitate medii, *or* neceſſitate præcepti, *which is much leſs; but only bindeth her Sons, for Peace ſake, not to oppoſe them.* And in another place more fully. *We do not ſuffer any Man to reject the thirty nine Articles of the*

Biſhop *Bramhall*. Schiſm Guarded. Sect. 7. p. 396.

Sect. 1. cap. 11. p. 190. V. Replication to the Biſhop of *Chalcedon*. p. 264.

Church

Church of England *at his pleaſure; yet neither do we look upon them as Eſſentials of Saving Faith, or Legacies of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: But in a mean, as Pious Opinions fitted for the Preſervation of Unity; neither do we oblige any Man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* By which we ſee, what a vaſt difference there is between thoſe things which are required by the *Church* of *England*, in order to Peace; and thoſe which are impoſed by the *Church* of *Rome*, as part of that *Faith*, *extra quam non eſt ſalus*, without belief of which there is no Salvation. In which ſhe hath as much violated the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, as the *Church* of *England* by her *Prudence* and *Moderation* hath ſtudied to preſerve it.

§. 7. 2. *Nothing ought to be impoſed as a neceſſary Article of Faith to be believed by all, but what may be evidently propounded to all Perſons, as a thing which God did require the explicit belief of.* It being impoſſible to make any thing appear a neceſſary Article of Faith, but what may not only be evidently proved to be revealed by *God*, but that *God* doth oblige all Men to the belief of it in order to Salvation. And therefore none of thoſe things, whoſe obligation doth depend on *variety* of *Circumſtances*, ought in reaſon be made the *Bonds* of that *Communion* which cannot take notice of that *variety* as to Mens Conditions and Capacities. There are many things in *Chriſtian Religion*, which, whoſoever believes the truth of it, cannot but eaſily diſcern to be neceſſary in order to the profeſſion and practice of it, in moſt of which the common Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind is agreed. Not only the *Exiſtence of a Deity*, the clear diſcovery of the *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs* and *Power* of God, with his *Providence* over the World, and the *Immortality* of *Souls*, being therein moſt evidently revealed; but, the way and manner of the reſtitution of Men's Souls by *Faith* in *Jeſus Chriſt* as our only *Saviour*, and *Obedience* to his *Commands*, is ſo fully laid down in the cleareſt Terms, that no rational Man, who conſiders the nature of *Chriſtian Religion*, but muſt aſſert the profeſſion of all theſe things to be neceſſary to all ſuch, who own Chriſtian Religion to be true. But there are many other things in Chriſtian Religion, which are neither ſo clearly revealed in the *Scriptures*, nor unanimouſly aſſented to in any Age of the *Chriſtian Church*; and, why any ſuch things ſhould be made the Conditions of that *Communion* in the *Catholick Church*, whoſe very Being depends only on neceſſary things, would puzzle a *Philoſopher* to underſtand. As if none ſhould be accounted *Mathematicians*, but ſuch as could ſquare Circles; and none *Naturaliſts*, but ſuch as could demonſtrate whether quantity were infinitely diviſible or no: Much ſo it is, if none ſhould be accounted Members of the *Catholick Church*, but ſuch as own the truth and neceſſity of ſome at leaſt as diſputable Points, as any in Religion. Let therefore any *Romaniſt* tell me, whether the *Pope's Supremacy* be as clear in *Scripture*, as that *Chriſt is Saviour of the World*; whether *Purgatory* be as plain as *Eternal Life*; *Tranſubſtantiation* as evident, as that the *Euchariſt ought to be adminiſtred*; whether *Invocation of Saints* be as manifeſt, as the *Adoration of God*; the Doctrine of *Indulgencies*, as *Repentance from dead Works*; and if there be ſo great a clearneſs in the Revelation of the one, and ſo far from it as to the other; let them give any juſt account why the belief of the one is made as neceſſary to Salvation as the other is. Certainly, ſuch who take in things, at leaſt ſo diſputable as all theſe are, and enforce the belief of them in order to their Communion, cannot otherwiſe be thought but to have a deſign to exclude a great part of the Chriſtian World from their Communion; and, to do ſo, and then cry out of them as *Schiſmaticks*, is the moſt unreaſonable Proceeding in the World.

3. *Nothing*

3. *Nothing ought to be required as a neceſſary Article of Faith, but what hath been believed and received for ſuch by the Catholick Church of all Ages.* §. 8. For, ſince neceſſary Articles of Faith are ſuppoſed to be ſo antecedently to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*, ſince the *Catholick Church* doth ſuppoſe the continual acknowledgment of ſuch things as are neceſſary to be believed; it is but juſt and reaſonable to admit nothing as neceſſary, but what appears to have been ſo univerſally received. Thence it is, that *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent*, are ſo much inſiſted on by *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, in order to the proving any thing to be a neceſſary Article of Faith. But the great Difficulty of this lies in finding out what was received for a neceſſary Article of Faith, and what was not by the *Catholick Church*; which being a Subject as neceſſary, as ſeldom ſpoken to, I ſhall not leave it untouched, although I muſt premiſe, that Rule to be much more uſeful in diſcovering what was not looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, than what was; and therefore I begin with that firſt.

1. It is ſufficient evidence, that was not looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, *which was not admitted into the Ancient Creeds.* Whether all thoſe Declarations which were inſerted in the enlargements of the *Apoſtolical Creed*, by the *Councils* of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople*, and in that *Creed* which goes under the name of *Athanaſius*, were really judged by the *Catholick Church* of all *Ages*, to be neceſſary to Salvation, is not here my buſineſs to enquire; but there ſeems to be a great deal of Reaſon for the *Negative*, that what was not inſerted in the *Ancient Creeds*, was not by them judged neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians. I know, it is ſaid by ſome of your Party, *That the Apoſtolical Creed did only contain thoſe Articles which were neceſſary to be believed, in oppoſition to the preſent Hereſies which were then in the Church.* As though the neceſſity of believing in Chriſtians, came only by an *Antiperiſtaſis* of the oppoſition of *Hereticks*; And if there had been no Hereticks to have denied *God's being the Creatour, and Chriſt's being the Saviour*; it had not been neceſſary to have believed either of them ſo explicitly as now we do. But when we ſpeak of all things neceſſary to be believed by all; I mean not, that all Circumſtances of things contained in thoſe *Creeds* are neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation; but, that all thoſe things which were judged as neceſſary to be believed by all, were therein inſerted, will appear to any one who either conſiders the expreſſions of the *Ancients* concerning the *Creeds* then in uſe; or the primary reaſon why ſuch *Summaries* of *Faith* were ever made in the Chriſtian Church. The Teſtimonies of the *Fathers* to this purpoſe are ſo well known in this Subject, that it were a needleſs task to repeat them, who ſo unanimouſly aſſert the *ſufficiency*, *unalterableneſs*, and *perfection* of that *Faith*, which is contained in the *Creed*; making it, *the ſum of all neceſſary Doctrines, the Foundation of the Catholick Faith, and of the Church, the firſt and ſole Confeſſion of Evangelical Doctrine.* Of all which, and many more expreſſions to the ſame purpoſe, produced not only by our Writers, but by yours too, no tolerable ſenſe can be made, without aſſerting, that whatever was judged neceſſary to be believed by all, by the *Catholick Church* of that *Age* they lived in, or before them, was therein contained. Beſides, what account can be given, why any ſuch *Summaries* of *Faith* ſhould at all be made either by *Apoſtles*, or *Apoſtolical Perſons*; but only for that end, that neceſſary *Articles of Faith* might be reduced into ſuch a compaſs, as might become portable to the weakeſt Capacities? If the riſe of *Creeds* were (as moſt probable

Irenæus l. 1. *c.* 2, 3. *Tertul. de veland. virgin. c.* 1. *de præſcript. c.* 13, 14. *Cyril. Hieroſolymit. Catech.* 4, 5. *Hieron. ep.* 61. *ad Pammach. Auguſtin. de ſymbol. ad Catech. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *de temp. ſerm.* 115, 119, 131, 181. *Ambroſ. ſerm.* 38. *de jejun. & Quadrag.* &c. *Hilar. ad Conſtant. Aug. Ruffinus in ſymbol. c.* 2.

ble it was) from the things propounded to the *Catechumens* to be believed in order to Baptiſm, can we reaſonably think, that any thing judged neceſſary to be believed, ſhould be left out? If the *Apoſtolical Creed* be a ſummary comprehenſion of that *Form of ſound Doctrine*, which the *Apoſtles* delivered to all Chriſtians at their firſt Converſion (as it is generally ſuppoſed) either we muſt think the *Apoſtles* unfaithful in their Work, or the *Creed* an unfaithful account of their Doctrine, or that ſuch things which were ſuppoſed univerſally neceſſary to be believed, are therein comprehended. Which is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that nothing ought to be looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, or was ſo eſteemed by the *Catholick Church*, which is not contained in the Ancient Creeds.

2. Nothing ought to be judged a neceſſary Article of Faith, but *what was univerſally believed by the Catholick Church, to be delivered as ſuch by Chriſt, or his Apoſtles.* So that it is not the judgment, but the Teſtimony of the *Catholick Church*, which muſt be relyed on, and that Teſtimony only, when univerſal, as delivering what was once infallibly delivered by *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*. From whence it follows, that any one who will undertake to make out any thing as a neceſſary Article of Faith, by *Catholick Tradition* meerly, muſt do theſe things:

1. He muſt make it appear to be univerſally embraced at all times, and in all places, by ſuch who were Members of the *Catholick Church.*

2. That none ever oppoſed it, but he was preſently diſowned as no Member of the *Catholick Church*, becauſe oppoſing ſomething neceſſary to Salvation.

3. That it be delivered by all thoſe Writers of the *Church*, who give an account of the *Faith of Chriſtians*, or what was delivered by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* to the *Church.*

4. That it was not barely looked on as neceſſary to be believed by ſuch as might be convinced it was of *Divine Revelation*, but that it was delivered with a neceſſity of its being explicitly believed by all.

5. That what is delivered by the conſent of the *Writers* of the *Catholick Church*, was undoubtedly the *Conſent* of the *Church* of thoſe Ages.

6. That all thoſe *Writers* agree not only in the *Belief* of the thing it ſelf, but of the *Neceſſity* of it to all Chriſtians.

7. That no *Writers* or *Fathers* of ſucceeding *Ages*, can be ſuppoſed to *alter* in the belief, either of the matters believed before, or the neceſſity of them.

8. That no Oppoſitions of Hereticks, or Heats of Contention, could make them judge any Article ſo oppoſed, to be *more neceſſary*, than it was judged before that Contention; or they themſelves would have judged it, had it not been ſo oppoſed.

9. That when they affirm many *Traditions* to be *Apoſtolical*, which yet varied in ſeveral Churches, they could not affirm any *Doctrine* to be *Apoſtolical*, which they were not univerſally agreed in.

10. That when they ſo plainly aſſert the ſufficiency of the *Scriptures* as a Rule of Faith, they did yet believe ſomething neceſſary to Salvation, which was not contained therein.

When you, or any one elſe, will undertake to make good theſe Conditions; I ſhall then begin to believe, that ſomething may be made to appear to be a neceſſary Article of Faith, which is not clearly revealed in Scripture, but not before: But till then this *Negative* will ſuffice, that nothing ought to be embraced, as the judgment of the Church concerning a neceſſary Article of Faith, but what appears to be clearly revealed in Scripture, and univerſally embraced by the Catholick Church of all Ages.

3. Nothing

3. Nothing ought to be looked on as a neceſſary Article of Faith, by the judgment of the Catholick Church, the *denyal of which was not univerſally oppoſed, and condemned as Hereſie.* For otherwiſe the *Catholick Church* was very little ſenſible of the honour of *Chriſtian Faith*, if it ſuffered Diſſenters in neceſſary things, without putting a mark of diſhonour upon them. Therefore we may conclude, that whatever was patiently born with in ſuch as diſſented from the generality of Chriſtians, eſpecially, if conſiderable *Perſons* in the *Church*, were the Authors or Fomenters of ſuch Opinions, however true the contrary Doctrine was ſuppoſed to be, yet it was not ſuppoſed neceſſary, becauſe then the oppoſers would have been condemned of Hereſie, by ſome open Act of the *Catholick Church.*

But if, beyond theſe *Negatives*, we would enquire what was poſitively §. 9.
believed as neceſſary to Salvation by the *Catholick Church*; we ſhall hardly find any better way, than by the Articles of the *Ancient Creeds*, and the univerſal oppoſition of any new Doctrine on its firſt appearance, and the condemning the broachers of it for *Hereſie* in *Oecumenical Councils*, with the continual Diſapprobation of thoſe Doctrines by the *Chriſtian Churches of all Ages.* As is clear in the caſes of *Arrius* and *Pelagius.* For it ſeems very reaſonable to judge, that ſince the neceſſary Articles of Faith were all delivered by the *Apoſtles* to the *Catholick Church*, ſince the Foundation of that *Church* lies in the belief of thoſe things, which are *neceſſary*, that nothing ſhould be delivered contrary to any *neceſſary Article of Faith*, but the *Church*, by ſome *evident Act*, muſt declare its diſlike of it, and its reſolution thereby to adhere to that neceſſary Doctrine, which was *once delivered to the Saints.* And withal, it ſeems reaſonable, that becauſe Art and Subtilty may be uſed by ſuch who ſeek to pervert the *Catholick Doctrine*, and to wreſt the plain places of *Scripture*, which deliver it, ſo far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary Capacities may be able to clear themſelves of ſuch Miſts as are caſt before their Eyes; the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* in ſucceeding Ages, may be a very uſeful way for us to embrace the true Senſe of Scripture, eſpecially in the great Articles of the *Chriſtian Faith.* As for inſtance, in the Doctrine of the *Deity of Chriſt*, or the *Trinity*; though the Subtilty of ſuch Modern Hereticks, who oppoſe either of theſe, may ſo far prevail on Perſons, either not of ſufficient judgment, or not ſufficiently verſed in the *Scriptures*, as at preſent to make them acknowledge the places are not ſo clear as they imagined them to be; yet they being always otherwiſe interpreted by the *Catholick Church*, or the *Chriſtian Societies* of all Ages, lays this potent Prejudice againſt all ſuch attempts, as not to believe ſuch interpretations *true*, till they give a juſt account, why, if the belief of theſe *Doctrines* were not *neceſſary*, the *Chriſtians* of all Ages from the *Apoſtles* times, did ſo unanimouſly agree in them, that when any began firſt to oppoſe them, they were declared and condemned for *Hereticks* for their pains. So that the *Church* of *England* doth very piouſly declare her conſent with the Ancient *Catholick Church*, in not admitting any thing to be delivered as the ſenſe of *Scripture*, which is contrary to the conſent of the *Catholick Church* in the four firſt Ages. Not as though the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* were pretended to be any infallible Rule of interpreting *Scripture* in all things which concern the Rule of Faith; but that it is a ſufficient *Preſcription* againſt any thing which can be alledged out of Scripture, that if it appear contrary to the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* from the beginning, it ought not to be looked on as the true *meaning* of the *Scripture.* All this ſecurity is built upon this ſtrong Preſumption, that nothing contrary to the neceſſary *Articles* of

Faith, ſhould be held by the *Catholick Church*, whoſe very Being depends upon the belief of thoſe things which are neceſſary to Salvation. As long therefore as the *Church* might appear to be truly *Catholick* by thoſe Correſpondencies which were maintained between the ſeveral parts of it, that what was refuſed by one, was ſo by all; ſo long this unanimous and uncontradicted ſenſe of the *Catholick Church*, ought to have a great ſway upon the Minds of ſuch who yet profeſs themſelves Members of the *Catholick Church*. From whence it follows, that ſuch Doctrines may well be judged deſtructive to the Rule of Faith, which were ſo unanimouſly condemned by the *Catholick Church* within that time. And thus much may ſuffice for the firſt Enquiry, *viz. What things are to be eſteemed neceſſary, either in order to Salvation, or in order to Eccleſiaſtical Communion.*

§. 10. 2. *Whether any thing which was not neceſſary to Salvation, may by any means whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary, ſo that the not believing it becomes damnable, and unrepented deſtroys Salvation?* We ſuppoſe the Queſtion to proceed on ſuch things as could not antecedently to ſuch an Act whereby they now become neceſſary, be eſteemed to be ſo, either from the Matter, or from any expreſs Command. For you in Terms aſſert a neceſſity of believing diſtinct from the Matter, and abſolute Command, and hath the *Churches Definition* for its *formal Object*, which makes the neceſſity of our Faith continually to depend upon the Churches Definition; but this ſtrange kind of *Ambulatory Faith*, I ſhall now ſhew to be repugnant to the Deſign of Chriſt and his *Apoſtles*, in making known Chriſtian Religion, and to all evidence of Reaſon, and directly contrary to the plain and uncontradicted Senſe of the *Primitive and Catholick Church*.

1. It is contrary to the *deſign of Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, in making known the Chriſtian Religion to the World. For, if the deſign of Chriſt was to declare whatever was neceſſary to the Salvation of Mankind, if the *Apoſtles* were ſent abroad for this very end, then either they were very *unfaithful* in diſcharge of their truſt, or elſe they taught *all things neceſſary* for their Salvation; and, if they did ſo, how can any thing become *neceſſary*, which they did never teach? Was it not the great Promiſe concerning the *Meſſias*, that at his coming, *the Earth ſhould be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea*; that then *they ſhall all be taught of God?* Was not this the juſt expectation of the People concerning him, *That when he came he would tell them all things?* Doth not he tell his Diſciples, *That all things I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you?* And, for all this, is there ſomething ſtill remaining neceſſary to Salvation, which neither he, nor his Diſciples, did ever make known to the World? Doth not he *promiſe Life and Salvation to all ſuch as believe and obey his Doctrine?* And can any thing be neceſſary for eternal Life, which he never declared? Or did he only promiſe it to the Men of that *Age* and *Generation*, and leave others to the *Mercy* of the *Churches Definitions?* If this be ſo, we have ſad cauſe to lament our condition, upon whom theſe *heavy loyns* of the *Church* are fallen: How happy had we been, if we had lived in *Chriſt's*, or the *Apoſtles times*; for then we might have been ſaved, though we had never believed the *Pope's Supremacy*, or *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Invocation of Saints*, or *Worſhipping Images*; but now the caſe is altered; theſe *Milſtones* are now hung about our necks, and how we ſhall ſwim to Heaven with them, who knows? How ſtrangely miſtaken was our *Saviour*, when he ſaid, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believed*; For, much more bleſſed certainly were they, who did ſee him, and believe in him; for then he would undertake for their Salvation; but now, it ſeems, we are out of his reach, and turned over to the *Mercileſs*

Iſa. 11. 9. John 6. 45. John 4 25. John 15. 15.

Infal-

Infallibility of the *preſent Church.* When *Chriſt* told his Diſciples, *His yoke was eaſie, and burden light*; he little thought, what *Power* he had left in the *Church* to lay on ſo much *load*, as might *cripple* Men's belief; were it not for a good reſerve in a corner, call'd *Implicit Faith.* When he ſent the *Apoſtles to teach all that he commanded them*, he muſt be underſtood ſo, that the *Church* hath power to teach *more* if ſhe pleaſes; and though the *Apoſtles*, poor Men, were bound up by this Commiſſion, and St. *Peter* himſelf too, yet his *Infallible Succeſſors* have a *Paramount Privilege* beyond them all. Though the *Spirit* was promiſed to the Apoſtles, *to lead them into all Truth*, yet there muſt be no incongruity, in ſaying, They underſtood not ſome neceſſary Truths (for how ſhould they, when never revealed) as *Tranſubſtantiation, Supremacy, &c.* Becauſe, though they never dreamt of ſuch things, yet the *Infallible Church* hath done it ſince for them; and, to ſay truth, though the *Apoſtles* Names were put into the promiſe, yet they were but *Feoffees* in truſt for the *Church*, and the benefit comes to the Church by them. For they were only *Tutors* to the *Church* in its minority, teaching it ſome *poor Rudiments of Chriſt and Heaven*, of *Faith and Obedience, &c.* But the *great* and *Divine Myſteries* of the *ſeven Sacraments, Indulgences, Worſhip of Images, Sacrifice of the Maſs, &c.* were not fit to be made known till the *Church* were *at age* her ſelf, and knew how to declare her own mind. When St. *Paul* ſpeaks ſo much of the *great Myſteries hidden from Ages and Generations, but now made known*, it muſt be underſtood with a reference to thoſe *ſilly People* who lived in *that Age*; but there were *greater Myſteries* than theſe, which neither *Chriſt*, nor any *of his Apoſtles* were ever acquainted with, as *Purgatory*, and thoſe before-mentioned; for theſe were reſerved as the *Churches Portion*, when her *Infallibilityſhip* ſhould come *to Age.* St. *Paul*, honeſt Man, ſpake as he thought, when he told not the common People, but the *Biſhops* of the *Church*, *That he had not ſhunned to declare unto them all the Counſel of God*; but if he had lived to our *Age*, he would have heard of this miſtake with both ears; and if he had not ſworn the contrary, he muſt have been contented to have been call'd *Schiſmatick* and *Heretick* a thouſand times over. Theſe are all the juſt and rare Conſequences of your *Churches bleſſed Infallibility, and power of Defining things neceſſary, which were not ſo in Chriſt, or his Apoſtles times.* But, the greateſt *Knack* of all is yet behind; for Men are bound to believe all the *Doctrines* of your *Church* to be *Apoſtolical*, and yet that your *Church* hath power to make things neceſſary to be believed, which were not ſo in the *Apoſtolical times.* Yes, ſay you, *They were Doctrines then, but not ſo neceſſary as now, becauſe they had not the Churches Definition.* It ſeems, at laſt, the *Apoſtles* knew them, but did not underſtand the worth of them; elſe, no doubt, they were ſuch charitable Souls, they would have declared them to the World. *Bleſſed* St. *Paul*, who was continually employed in teaching and inſtructing Men in the way to Salvation, could he have held back any thing that had tended to it, when he ſays, *He kept back nothing that was profitable to them, but ſhewed them, and taught them publickly, and from houſe to houſe, teſtifying to the Jews, and alſo to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* What, not one word of the neceſſary Points all this while? Nothing of the *Church* of *Rome*, nor *Chriſt's Vicar on Earth*, and his *Infallibility?* How ſlily and cunningly did St. *Paul*, and the reſt of the *Apoſtles* carry it, if they had believed theſe things, never to let one word drop from their Mouths or Pens concerning them? And inſtead of that, ſpeak ſo, and write ſo, that one that believes them honeſt, would ſwear they never heard of them. In what another kind of ſtrain would St. *Paul* have writ

Act. 20. 27.

Act. 20. 20, 21.

to the *Church* of *Rome*, if he had had but any inkling of the *Chair* of *Infallibility*, being placed there? How ſoon would he have blotted out the whole 14*th Chapter* of his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, if he had known his *Holineſs* his pleaſure about *ſerving God in an unknown Tongue?* How well might he have ſpared ſaying, *That a Biſhop ſhould be the Husband of one Wife*, if he had known *de jure divino* he muſt have none at all? At what another rate would he have diſcourſed of the *Euchariſt*, had he believed *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Communion under one kind?* What courſe would he have taken with the *Schiſmatical Corinthians*, that were divided like other *Churches*, if he had known the *Infallible Judge of Controverſie?* If he had but underſtood the danger of *reading Scriptures*, he might have ſpared his Exhortations to the People *of the Word of God dwelling richly in them*, and filled his Epiſtles with *Pater Noſters*, and *Ave Mary's*, or given good directions about them. But he muſt be pardoned, he was ignorant of theſe things as well as we: Only St. *Paul* never heard of them, and we do not believe them; becauſe neither he, nor his Brethren ever revealed them to us, though they were the *Stewards of the Myſteries of God*; and they tell us themſelves, That *it is requiſite ſuch ſhould be faithful*, which we cannot underſtand how they could be, if they knew theſe deep Myſteries, but never diſcovered them that we can learn. But, if they knew them not, I pray from whence is it your *Church* learns them? *By immediate Inſpiration? No*, as bold as you are, you dare not challenge that: But whence then come you to know them to be neceſſary? *infallibly forſooth:* But whence comes this *Infallibility?* Muſt there not be a *peculiar Revelation*, to diſcover that to be neceſſary, which was never diſcovered to be ſo before? But if diſcovered before, and declared before, the things were as neceſſary before your *Churches Definition*, as after; and therefore your *Churches Definition* adds nothing of *neceſſity* to them. If *neither diſcovered*, nor *declared*, you muſt have particular *Revelation* for them, and then *work Miracles*, and we will believe you, but not otherwiſe; but, before you do it, conſider what St. *Paul* hath ſaid concerning *an Angel from Heaven Preaching another Goſpel*, *let him be accurſed*; and what can be more *Preaching another Goſpel*, than making other things *neceſſary to Salvation*, than *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* did? and think then what your *Church* hath deſerved for all her *Definitions* concerning *Articles of Faith*, or things neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation. But yet further you ſay, *That theſe things were declared by the Apoſtles*, *but they need a further Declaration now:* And why ſo? Shew us the *Apoſtle's Declaration*, and it ſufficeth us; we ſhall not believe them one jot the more for your additional Definition. And it is ſurely a ſign, you did not think the *Apoſtles Declaration* ſufficient, or elſe you would never pretend to new ones. Perhaps you will tell us, *It was to their Age*, *but not to ours?* Why not, as well as the other neceſſary Articles of Faith contained in *Scripture?* I know your Anſwer is, *We can know no neceſſary Article of Faith at all*; *but from your Church.* So then, we have brought all into a narrow compaſs, and inſtead of new *Definitions* of the *Church* concerning neceſſary things, we can know nothing at all to be *neceſſary to* be *believed*, but from your *Church.* This is *high*, but the *higher* it is, the *better Foundation* it had need ſtand on, which we ſhall throughly ſearch into, in the Controverſie of the reſolution of Faith: To which we refer it, and return. If there were once a *Declaration*, but ſtill there needs *another*, What is become of that *Declaration?* Was it loſt in its paſſage down to us? How then was that preſent *Church Infallible*, which *loſt a Declaration* in Matter of Faith? Was it neceſſary to be believed in the

the intermediate *Age* or no? If it was, then it was not *loſt*, and then what need a new *Declaration?* If not, then a thing once *neceſſary* to *Salvation*, may be *not neceſſary* to Salvation, and become *neceſſary to Salvation* again. But ſtill we have cauſe to envy their Happineſs, who lived in the Age when they might be ſaved without believing theſe things: For the caſe goes hard with us, for you tell us, Unleſs we believe them neceſſary, we cannot be ſaved; and our Conſciences tell us, that if we did profeſs to believe them neceſſary, when we do not, and cannot, we cannot be ſaved. What a caſe then were we in, if the *Pope* were *Chriſt's Vicar* in *Heaven*, as he pretends to *be on Earth?* but it is our comfort, he is neither ſo, nor ſo. Thus wee ſee what Repugnancy there is both to *Scripture* and *Reaſon* in this ſtrange Doctrine of your *Churches Definitions making things neceſſary to Salvation, which were not ſo before.*

§. 11. I ſhould now proceed to ſhew how repugnant this *Doctrine* is to the unanimous conſent of *Antiquity*; but I find my ſelf prevented in that, by the late *Writings* of one of your own *Communion*; and if you will believe him in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory* (which I much queſtion) *the preſent Pope's moſt humble Servant*, our Countryman Mr. *Thomas White*. Whoſe whole Book, call'd his *Tabulæ Suffragiales*, is purpoſely deſigned againſt this fond and abſurd Opinion; nay, he goes ſo high, as to aſſert the Opinion of the *Pope's Perſonal Infallibility*, not only to be *Heretical*, but *Archi-heretical*; and *that the propagating of this Doctrine is in its kind a moſt grievous Sin.* It cannot but much rejoice us to ſee, that Men of Wit and Parts begin to diſcover the intolerable Arrogance of ſuch Pretences, and that ſuch Men as Dr. *Holden*, and Mr. *White*, are in many things come ſo near the *Proteſtant Principles*; and that ſince they quit the *Plea* of *Infallibility*, and rely on *Univerſal Tradition*, we are in hopes that the ſame Reaſon and Ingenuity which carried theſe Perſons thus far, will carry others, who go on the ſame Principles, ſo much farther, as to ſee, how impoſſible it is to make good the Points in *Controverſie* between us, upon the *Principle of Univerſal Tradition.* Which the *Bigots* of your *Church* are ſufficiently ſenſible of, and therefore like the *Man* at *Athens*, when *your Hands* are *cut off*, you are reſolved to hold this Infallibility with *your Teeth:* And ſo that *Gentleman* finds by the proceedings of the *Court* of *Rome* againſt him for that and his other pieces. But, this ſhould not have been taken notice of, leſt we ſhould ſeem to ſee (as who doth not, that is not ſtark blind?) What growing Diviſions and *Animoſities* there are among your ſelves both at home, and in foreign Parts; and yet all this while the poor ſilly People muſt be told, that there is nothing but *Diviſion* out of your *Church*, and nothing but *Harmony* and *Muſick* in it, but ſuch as is made of *Diſcords.* And that about this preſent Controverſie; for the forenamed *Gentleman* in his Epiſtle to the *preſent Pope*, tells him plainly, *That it is found true by frequent Experience, that there is no defending the Catholick Faith againſt the Subtilties of his Heretical Countrymen, without the Principles of that Book, which was condemned at* Rome. And what thoſe Principles are, we may eaſily ſee by this Book, which is writ in defence of the former. Wherein he largely proves, that the *Church* hath no power to make *New Articles of Faith*, which he proves both from *Scripture*, *Reaſon* and *Authority*; this laſt, is that I ſhall refer the Reader to him for: For in his ſecond *Table*, as he calls it, he proves from the Teſtimonies of *Origen*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Cyril*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, Pope *Stephen*, *Hierom*, *Theophylact*, *Auguſtine*, *Vincentius Lerinenſis*, and ſeveral others; nay, the Teſti-

Tabulæ ſuff. cap. 19, 20, 21.

Neq; ſi complurium experimentis fidem habere liceat, adverſus noſtratium hæreticorum ſubtilitates fides Catholica ſuſtineri poteſt abſq; præcipuis hujus libelli dogmatibus, & (ſi conjicere fas ſit) aliquibus accuſatis. Tabulæ ſuffrag. ep. dedicat. ad Papam Alex. 7.

Tabulæ ſuffrag. tab. 2. p. 11, &c.

Teſtimonies, he ſays, to this purpoſe, are ſo many, that whole *Libraries* muſt be tranſcribed to produce them all. And afterwards more largely proves, That the Faith of the *Church* lies in a continued ſucceſſion from the *Apoſtles*, both from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, and abundance of *Church Authorities* in his 4. 5, and 6 *Tables:* And, through the reſt of his Book diſproves the *Infallibility of Councils and Pope.* And, can you think all this is anſwered by an *Index Expurgatorius*, or by publiſhing a *falſe Latin Order* of the *Inquiſition* at *Rome*, whereby his Books are prohibited, and his Opinions condemned as Heretical, Erroneous in Faith, Raſh, Scandalous, Seditious, and what not? It ſeems then, it is grown at laſt *de fide*, that the *Pope is Infallible*, and never more like to do ſo, than in this Age; for the ſame Perſon gives us this Character of it in his Purgation of himſelf, to the *Cardinals* of the Inquiſition, ſaying, *That their Eminencies, by the unhappineſs of the preſent Age, in which Knowledge is baniſhed out of the Schools, and the Doctrines of Faith and Theological Truths are judged by moſt Voices; fell, it ſeems, upon ſome ignorant and arrogant Conſultors; who, hand over head, condemn thoſe Propoſitions, which upon their Oaths, they could not tell whether they were true or falſe.* If theſe be your Proceedings at *Rome*, happy we that have nothing to do with ſuch *Infallible Ignorance:* This is the *Age* your *Religion* were like to thrive in, if *Ignorance* were as *predominant* elſewhere, as it ſeems it is at *Rome.* But I leave this, and return.

V. exemplar ipſius Decreti apud Tho. Albii purgat. p. 9.

Eminentiſſimos Præſules, infortunio præſentis ſæculi, in quo ſcientia ex Scholis exulat, & fidei & Theologiæ veritates numero votorum æſtimantur, incidiſſe in Conſultores ex majori parte & ignaros & arrogantes, qui intrepidè configant propoſitiones, quas jurati aſſerant ſe neſcire, ſint ne veræ vel falſæ. Appendix Albiana ad Purgat. lect. poſter. p. 212. A. D. 1662.

§. 12. 3. The laſt thing is, *Whether the Church hath Power by any Propoſition or Definition, to make any thing become neceſſary to Salvation, and to be believed as ſuch which was not ſo before?* But this is already anſwered by the foregoing Diſcourſe; for if the neceſſity of the things to be believed, muſt be ſuppoſed antecedently to the *Churches Being*, if that which was not before neceſſary, cannot by any Act whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary, then it unavoidably follows, That the Church neither hath, nor can have any ſuch Power. Other things which relate to this, we ſhall have occaſion to diſcuſs in following your Steps: Which having thus far cleared this important Controverſie, I betake my ſelf to.

And we are highly obliged to you, for the rare Divertiſements you give us in your excellent way of managing Controverſies. Had my *Lord of Canterbury* been living, What an excellent entertainment would your Confutation of his Book have afforded him? But, ſince ſo *pleaſant* a *Province* is fallen to my ſhare, I muſt learn to command my ſelf in the management of it, and therefore, where you preſent us with any thing which deſerves a ſerious Anſwer, for Truth and the Cauſes ſake, you ſhall be ſure to have it. In the firſt place, you charge his Lordſhip with a Fallacy, and that is, becauſe, when he was to ſpeak of Fundamentals, he did not ſpeak of that which was not Fundamental. *But*, ſay you, *He turns the Difficulty, which only proceeded upon a Fundamentality or Neceſſity, derived from the formal Object, that is, from the Divine Authority revealing that Point, to the Material Object, that is, to the importance of the Matter contained in the Point revealed; which is a plain Fallacy, in paſſing* à ſenſu formali ad materialem. Men ſeldom ſuſpect thoſe Faults in others, which they find not ſtrong Inclinations to in themſelves; had you not been conſcious of a notorious *Fallacy* in this diſtinction of *Formal and Material Object*, as here applied by you; you would never have ſuſpected any ſuch *Sophiſtry* in his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe. I pray conſider what kind of *Fundamentals* thoſe are, which the

P. 15. n. 4.

Queſtion

Question proceeds on, *viz.* such as are necessary to be owned as such by *all Churches*, in order to their being *true Churches*, as is plain by the rise of this Controversie; for Mr. *Fisher* was proving the *Greek Church to be no true Church*, and, in order to that, proves, that *she erred Fundamentally*, for which he makes *use* of this *Medium*; That, *whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental.* So that the whole Process of the Dispute lies thus. Whatever *Church* is guilty of a *Fundamental Errour*, ceaseth to be a *true Church*; but the *Greek Church* is guilty of a *Fundamental* Error; *ergo*. The *Minor* being denied, he thus proves it: *If whatever is defined by the Church be Fundamental, then the* Greek *Church is guilty of a Fundamental Error, because she denies something defined by the Church; but whatever is defined by the Church is Fundamental*; which is the thing his Lordship denies, and his Adversary is bound to prove. So that any one who was not resolved to wink as hard as you do, might easily see, the State of the Controversie doth not concern what things are *Fundamental*, supposing Men know them to be *sufficiently propounded*; but what things are so necessary to be owned for *Fundamentals*, that upon the denying them, a *Church* ceaseth to be a *true Church*. Yet this mistake, as gross and palpable as it is, runs through your whole Discourse of *Fundamentals*, which, without it, cannot hold together. If you will therefore prove, that, besides such things whose necessity ariseth from the Matter, there are other from the Formal Object, which all *Churches* are equally bound to believe, in order to their being *true Churches*, you do something; but not before.

But we must still attend your Motions, especially when they tend towards Proofs, as yours do now. For, say you, *Now I shew (the difficulty being understood, as it ought to be of the Formal Object, whereby Points of Faith are manifested to Christians) that all Points defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, are Fundamental; that is, necessary to Salvation to be believed, by all those to whom they are sufficiently propounded to be so defined by this Argument. Whosoever refuseth to believe any thing sufficiently propounded to him for a Truth revealed from God, commits a Sin damnable and destructive of Salvation: But, whosoever refuses to believe any Point sufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, refuses to believe a thing sufficiently propounded to him for a Truth revealed from God.* Ergo, *Whosoever refuses to believe any Point sufficiently propounded to him for defined by the Church as Matter of Faith, commits a Sin damnable and destructive of Salvation.* Before you proceed to the Proof of your *Minor*, several things must here be considered, that we may better understand your meaning, and know what it is you intend to prove. Especially what you intend by *sufficient Proposition.* Do you mean such a Proposition as carries Evidence along with it, or not? In which case the very understanding the Terms, is *sufficient Proposition*, as that, *two and two make four*; but, I suppose, you mean not this, therefore it must be the *sufficient Proposition of something which wants natural Evidence*; and therefore something else must be required, besides the propounding the thing, to make the Proposition be said to be sufficient. For *Sufficiency* relates to some *End*; so that a sufficient Proposition must be such a *Proposition* as is *sufficient* for its End: Now the end of the *Proposition* of *Matters* of *Faith*, is, that they may be *believed*; and therefore the *sufficiency* of the *Proposition* lies in the *Arguments* or *Motives* inducing Men to believe. Now the *Objects* of *Faith* being of a different nature, the *Sufficiency* of the *Proposition* must be taken from a respect to them: For in things which are so clearly revealed, as necessary to Salvation, that none who acknowledge the *Scripture to be God's Word*,

can

can doubt but such things are necessary; in this case the *Sufficiency* of the *Proposition* lies in the *Evidence* of *Divine Revelation*, and the clearness of it to all Understandings who consider it, and the *Reasons* or *Motives* of Faith in that case, are the same with those which induce Men to believe, that the *Scripture it self is from Divine Revelation.* But there being other things in *Scripture*, which neither appear so clear, or so necessary to be believed by all, something else is required in order to a *sufficient Proposition* of them, and in order to the making any of these things universally obligatory to *Christians* on pain of Damnation, for not believing them, these things are necessary. 1. It must be *much clearer* than the thing which is propounded to be believed on the account of it; for, to propound a thing to be believed by something at least as disputable as the matter it self, cannot certainly be called a *sufficient Proposition.* 2. It must be *antecedently proved* to be a true and certain Proposition, before any thing can be believed on the account of it. For, if Men cannot see any reason to believe that there is any *necessary Connexion* between that which you call a sufficient Proposition, and any Matter of Faith; they cannot be guilty of any Sin at all in not believing what you think is sufficiently propounded. But, in this case, it is not your judgment, what *Proposition* is sufficient that makes it so, but the *Reason* of the *Thing*, and the *Evidence* that *God* hath appointed that way to reveal his Will to Men, and that what is so propounded is necessary to be believed. As for instance, suppose you were told by the *Greek Church*, that to believe the *Pope's Supremacy, jure divino*, were a damnable Sin, and that whosoever did not believe this being sufficiently propounded to them as a Matter of Faith, as defined by the *Church*, were guilty of a Sin destructive to Salvation, what answer would you return in this case? Would you not say, That the *Proposition*, though judged *sufficient* by them, is not judged so by you; and that they must first prove, that whatever their *Church defines* as a Matter of Faith, is to be believed for such, before the other can be believed on the account of it? Just the same Answer we return to you; prove first of all to us in a clear and evident manner, that *God* hath appointed the *Definition* of your *Church*, as the means whereby we may be infallibly *assured*, what is *Matter* of *Faith*, and what not; and then we may grant, that what your *Church* propounds as a Matter of Faith, is sufficiently propounded as a Matter revealed from God, but not before. For, while I see no reason to believe the *Churches Proposition* to be *sufficient*, I have no reason to believe, that what she propounds, as defined for Matter of Faith, is truly so: And, as long as I can see no reason to believe it, prove the disbelief of it to be a Sin in me when you can. Thus we see how far from being evident that *Major* of yours is, though you are pleased to tell us, it is so; but we do not believe your *Defining* it to be so, to be *any Matter of Faith*, unless we had better reason for it than we have. For, say you, *To refuse to believe God's Revelation, is either to give God the Lye, or to doubt whether he speak Truth or no?* But, have you so little wit, as not to distinguish between *not believing God's Revelation*, and *not believing what is propounded for God's Revelation?* Must every one, who doth not believe every thing that is propounded for *God's Revelation*, presently give *God the Lye, and doubt whether he speak Truth or no?* And are not you then guilty of that fault every time a *Quaker* or *Enthusiast* tells you, That the *Spirit of God within him told him this and that?* But you said, *Sufficiently propounded.* But the Question is, What *sufficient Proposition* is, and who must be Judge whether the Proposition be sufficient or no, you, or the Conscience of the Person to whom the thing is proposed

to

to be believed? If any one indeed that judgeth a Propoſition ſufficient, do notwithſtanding queſtion the *truth* of it, he doth interpretatively call *God's Veracity* into queſtion; but not he certainly who thinks not *God's Veracity* at all concerned in that which *you call* a ſufficient Propoſition, but *he judgeth not to be ſo.*

Let us now ſee, how you prove your *Aſſumption*, which is very fairly done from a Suppoſition which his *Lordſhip* denies; which is, *That General Councils cannot err.* But, ſay you, he adds, *That though he ſhould grant it, yet this cannot down with him, that all Points even ſo defined were Fundamentals.* I grant, thoſe are his Words, and his Reaſons follow them. *For, Deductions are not prime and native Principles; nor are Superſtructures, Foundations. That which is a Foundation for all, cannot be one and another to different Chriſtians, in regard of it ſelf; for then it could be no common Rule for any, nor could the Souls of Men reſt upon a ſhaking Foundation, No, if it be a true Foundation, it muſt be common to all, and firm under all; in which ſenſe the Articles of Chriſtian Faith are Fundamental.* What now do you prove to deſtroy this? You very ſtrenuouſly prove, That if Men believe, a *General Council cannot err*, they believe it *cannot err ſo far*, and *no further* than *it cannot err.* But, if you mean any thing further, your meaning is better than your proof: For when you would prove that *to disbelieve the Churches Definition, is to disbelieve God's Revelation*; and in order to that confound the *Church and General Councils together*, and from the *General Council's not erring*, infer the former Propoſition, *becauſe, what is teſtified by the Church, is teſtified by an Authority that cannot err*; you do not conſider, that all this while you prove nothing againſt his Lordſhip, unleſs you firſt prove, that whatever is teſtified to be revealed from *God*, is preſently *Fundamental* to all *Churches* and *Chriſtians*, which his Lordſhip utterly denies, by diſtinguiſhing even things which may be teſtified to be revealed from *God*, into ſuch *things* as are common to all Chriſtians to be believed by them, and ſuch things as vary according to the different reſpects of Chriſtians. But yet further, I add, that taking *Fundamentals* in your ſenſe, you prove not the thing you intended, but only to ſuch as do acknowledge, and as far as they do acknowledge, that *General Councils cannot err.* For, they who acknowledge them infallible only in *Fundamentals*, do not judge any thing *Fundamental* by their *Deciſion*, but judge their *Deciſions infallible*, ſo long as they hold to *Fundamentals*; and ſo (for all that I can ſee) leave themſelves *Judges*, *when General Councils are infallible*, and *when not*: And therefore if they go about to teſtifie any thing as revealed from *God*, which is not Fundamental, they do not believe that their Teſtimony cannot err, and ſo are not bound to believe that it is from God. They who believe *General Councils abſolutely Infallible*, I do verily think do believe *General Councils infallible in all they ſay*; for that is the ſubſtance of all you ſay. But, what that is to thoſe who neither do, nor can ſee any reaſon to believe them infallible in all they ſay or teſtifie as revealed from God, I neither do, nor can poſſibly underſtand. And, if you hope ſuch kind of Arguments *can ſatisfie your ingenuous Reader*, you ſuppoſe him a *good-natur'd Man* in the *Greek* ſenſe of the Phraſe.

P. 28. n. 3.

P. 16.

But all of a ſudden, we find you in a very generous ſtrain, and are contented to take Fundamentals for Fundamentals (which is a huge Conceſſion, and his Lordſhip, were he living, would take it for a ſingular favour from you.) *Yet to deal freely with the Biſhop* (ſay you) *even taking Fundamentals in a general way* (as it ought to be taken only here) *for a thing belonging to the Foundation of Religion* (and it is a ſtrange Fundamental

which hath no reſpect to the Foundation, but they who build downwards, muſt have their *Foundations* on *the tops* of their *Houſes.*) *It is alſo manifeſt, that all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental, by reaſon of that formal Object, or infallible Authority, propounding them, though not always by reaſon of the matter which they contain.* The main proof of which lies in this,
P. 16, 17. That *he who doth not believe the Church infallible, can believe nothing at all infallibly, and therefore no Fundamental of Religion; but, if he believe any thing upon the Churches Infallibility, he muſt believe all things on the ſame account of her Infallibility, and therefore muſt believe all equally; and ſo, whatever is propounded by the Church, is to be believed as Fundamental.* This you cannot deny to be the force and ſtrength of your verboſe, and confuſed way of arguing. And therefore I give you a ſhort Anſwer, That I utterly deny the *Infallibility* of any *Church*, to be in any thing the *Foundation* of *Divine* and *Infallible Faith*; as you will find it abundantly proved in the proper place for it, in the *Controverſie of the Reſolution of Faith.* Where it will be largely diſcuſſed, in what ſenſe *Faith* may be ſaid to be *Divine and Infallible*, what the proper *Grounds* and *Reaſons* of our *believing* are, and how much you impoſe upon the World, in pretending that the Reſolution of *Faith*, is into the *Catholick Churches Infallibility*; whereby it will appear to be far from a Fundamental Error, not to believe on the *Churches Infallibility*, and that he who denies it, will have no reaſon to call into Queſtion the *Canon of Scripture*, or the *Foundations of all Religion.* But, that you rather, by theſe abſurd and unreaſonable Pretences of yours, have done your utmoſt to ſhake the true *Foundations* of *Religion*, and advance nothing but *Scepticiſm*, not to ſay *Atheiſm* in the World. Theſe things I take upon me to make good in their proper place, and therefore ſhall not enter the diſcuſſion of them here: But ſince, this is the main, and, in truth, the only *Foundation* of your *Doctrine* of *Fundamentals*, the Vanity, Falſhood and Abſurdity of it, cannot be ſufficiently underſtood, till we have gone through the *Account* of the *Grounds of Faith.*

If St. *Auguſtine* make ſome *no Catholick Chriſtians, for holding obſtinately ſome things of no great moment in his Book of Hereſies*; it was, becauſe by *Catholick Chriſtians* he underſtood all ſuch, and only ſuch, as were the Members of the *ſound* and *Orthodox* Church, in oppoſition to all kind of *unneceſſary ſeparation* from it upon matters of ſmall moment, and not becauſe he believed the *Churches Infallibility*, in defining all Matters of Faith; and that all ſuch things were ſo defined, which Men are called *Hereticks* for denying of: Unleſs you will ſuppoſe, it was ever infallibly defined, that there were no *Antipodes*; for ſome were accounted *Hereticks* for believing them; and that by ſuch whom you account greater than St. *Auſtin.* But, for St. *Auſtin*, how far it was from his meaning, to have all thoſe accounted *Fundamental Errors*, which he recounts in his Book of *Hereſies*, appears not only from the multitude of particulars mentioned in it, which no one in his ſenſes can acknowledge *Fundamental*, or declared by the *Church* as *neceſſary to be believed by all*, but from his declared ſcope and deſign in the Preface to that Book, wherein it appears, he was deſired not only to write the greater Errors concerning *Faith*, the *Trinity*, *Baptiſm*, *Repentance*, *Chriſt*, the *Reſurrection*, the *Old and New Teſtament*, *Sed omnia omnino quibus à veritate diſſentiunt*, *i. e.* all kind of Errors whatſoever; and do you think that there could then be no Error, but it muſt be againſt ſomething then defined by the *Church as neceſſary to Salvation?* If not, then all Truths were then *defined by the Church*, and conſequently there could be no new *Definitions* ever ſince; if there might, then thoſe Errors mentioned by St. *Auſtin*, were

were not about Matters neceſſary to be believed; and ſo St. *Auſtin*'s Book of *Hereſies* makes nothing for you; but very much againſt you, conſidering that in all that Black Liſt of *Hereticks*, there are none brought in for denying thoſe grand *Fundamentals* of your *Church*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, your *Churches Infallibility*, nor any of that new brood of *neceſſary* Articles, which were ſo prudently hatcht by the *Council* of *Trent*. But if St. *Auſtin* do you no good, you hope St. *Gregory Nazianzen* may, becauſe he ſaith, *That nothing can be more perillous than thoſe Hereticks, who with a drop of Poiſon do infect our Lord's ſincere Faith.* Therefore all things defined by the Church are *Fundamental.* What an excellent Art this *Logick* is, that can fetch out of things that which was never in them! What a rare Conſequence is this, *If Hereſie be dangerous*, then, whatever is defined by the *Church*, *is Fundamental:* But it may be, the ſtrength lies in the *drop of Poiſon*, as though St. *Gregory* thought a *drop of Poiſon* as dangerous as a *whole Doſe* of it. But, were I your *Phyſician*, inſtead of the leaſt *drop* of *Poiſon*, I ſhould preſcribe you good ſtore of *Hellebore*, and ſhould hope to ſee the effect of it, in making better Conſequences than theſe are. But to ſee yet further, the ſtrange effects that *Logick* hath upon ſome Men; for, ſay you, in the Proſecution of your Proof, that all things defined by the Church are Fundamental. *Hence it is, that Chriſt our Saviour* ſaith, *Matth.* 8. 17. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* The Argument in form runs thus; Whoſoever deſerves Excommunication, is guilty of a Fundamental Error; but he that will not hear the Church, deſerves Excommunication; *ergo*, Or elſe there may be more in it than ſo. For, no doubt, the *Heathens and Publicans* as ſuch, were guilty of Fundamental Errors; therefore they who will not hear the Church, are guilty of as Fundamental Errors as *Heathens and Publicans.* But, before you urge us any more with this dreadful Argument, I pray tell us, What that *Church* is which our Saviour ſpeaks of; what the caſes are, wherein the Church is to be heard; what the full importance is, of being as a *Heathen and Publican*; and you muſt prove this *Church* to be underſtood in your ſenſe of the *Catholick Church*, and that this Church hath hereby Power to *define Matters of Faith*, and that none can poſſibly in any other ſenſe be accounted as *Heathens and Publicans*, but as guilty of as *Fundamental Errors* as they were.

Your next Objection concerning *giving God and the Church the Lye, and preferring and oppoſing a Man's private judgment and Will before and againſt the Judgment and Will of God and the Church, if Men deny or doubt of any thing made known by the Church to be a Truth revealed by God*; ſignifies nothing at all, unleſs it be antecedently proved, that the Church can never err in declaring any thing to be a Truth revealed by God, which none, who know what you mean by the *Church*, will eaſily aſſent to, till you have attempted a further Proof of it, than yet we find. And, although the queſtioning Divine Veracity *be deſtructive to that* which you call *Supernatural Faith*, yet I hope it is poſſible to believe *God to be true*, and yet that *all Men are lyars*, or that there is no ſuch inſeparable Connexion between *God's Veracity*, and the *preſent Declarations of any Church*, but that one may heartily aſſent to the former, and yet queſtion the truth of the latter. If you think otherwiſe, ſhew your Pity to the Weakneſs of our Underſtandings, by ſomething that may look like a proof of it, which we are ſtill much to ſeek for.

§. 14. p. 18. But, your greateſt ſtrength, like *Sampſon*'s, ſeems to lie there *where one would leaſt ſuſpect it*, viz. *in* Athanaſius *his Creed.* For thus you go on. *Wherefore it is ſaid in St.* Athanaſius *his Creed (which is approved in the thirty nine Articles of the pretended* Engliſh *Church) that, Whoſoever will be ſaved, it is neceſſary that he hold the Catholick Faith——which unleſs every one hold whole and inviolate, without doubt he ſhall periſh for ever: Neither can the Biſhop reply, That all Points expreſſed therein are Fundamental in his Senſe; for (to omit the Article of our Saviour's Deſcent into Hell) he mentions expreſly the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, which his Lordſhip hath denied to be a Fundamental Point, as we ſaw in the former Chapter.* But, the better to comprehend the Force of this Argument, we muſt firſt conſider what it is you intend to prove by it, and then in what way and manner you prove it from this *Creed.* The matter which you are to prove, is, that all things defined by the *Church* are Fundamental, *i. e.* in your Senſe *neceſſary to Salvation*; and, that the ground why ſuch things, whoſe matter is not neceſſary, do become neceſſary, is, becauſe the Church declares them to be revealed by *God*; now, in order to this, you inſiſt upon the *Creed*, commonly call'd *Athanaſius* his, wherein ſome things, acknowledged not to be *Fundamental* in the matter, are yet ſaid to be *neceſſary to Salvation*, and that this is owned by the *Church* of *England.* This is the ſubſtance of the Argument, which being reſolved into its parts, will conſiſt of theſe Propoſitions. 1. That ſome things owned not to be Fundamental in the Matter, are yet acknowledged in the *Creed* of *Athanaſius*, to be neceſſary to Salvation. 2. That the reaſon why theſe things do become *neceſſary*, is, becauſe the *Church* hath defined them to be ſo. 3. That this is acknowledged by the *Church* of *England.* And therefore, by parity of Reaſon, whatever is defined by the Church, muſt be neceſſary to Salvation. But every one of theſe *Propoſitions* being ambiguous, the clear ſtating of them will be the beſt way of ſolving the Difficulty, which ſeems to lie in the preſent Argument. And the main Ambiguity lies in the meaning of that *neceſſity to Salvation*, which is implied in the *Athanaſian Creed*, as to the Articles therein contained; for, there being different *Grounds* and *Reaſons* upon which things may be ſuppoſed *neceſſary*, there can be no juſt Conſequence made from the general owning a *neceſſity* of the *Belief* of ſome things, to the making thoſe things neceſſary to be believed upon one particular account of it. For the *neceſſity* of believing things to Salvation, may ariſe from one of theſe three Grounds. 1. The *Suppoſition*, that the Matter to be believed is in *it ſelf neceſſary*, this makes it *neceſſary* to all thoſe Perſons who are of that Perſwaſion; and on this Ground it is plain, that the main Articles of the *Athanaſian Creed* are generally ſuppoſed neceſſary, *viz.* thoſe concerning the *Trinity in Unity*, the *Incarnation*, *Reſurrection*, and *Eternal Life*, &c. Now theſe being ſuppoſed to be neceſſary from the *Matter*, any Church may own them under this degree of *neceſſity*, in that expreſſion uſed in ſeveral places of the *Athanaſian Creed*, *Whoſoever will be ſaved, it is neceſſary that he hold the Catholick Faith——which Catholick Faith is*, &c. But then we are to conſider, that this is only a Declaration of the ſenſe of that *Church*, what things ſhe owns as *neceſſary*, and what not. And this Declaration doth not oblige the Conſcience of particular Perſons any further, than as the Articles of that *Church* are required to be owned as the *Conditions* of *Communion* with her, *i. e.* where the *degree* of *neceſſity* is not declared, nor expreſly owned by a Church, but left in general Terms; no Man is bound to *believe* the things judged as *neceſſary*, with any particular kind of *neceſſity* excluſive of others,

but

but only that the *Church* in *General* may uſe that *Creed* ſuppoſed neceſſary, and that the Uſe of that *Creed* is a lawful Condition of that *Churches Communion.* 2. The belief of a thing may be ſuppoſed *neceſſary*, becauſe of the clear *Conviction* of Men's Underſtandings, that though the Matters be not in themſelves neceſſary, yet being *revealed by God*, they muſt be explicitly believed; but then the *neceſſity* of this Belief doth extend no further than the *clearneſs* of that Conviction doth. As, ſuppoſe it inſerted into a *Creed*, that the Article of the *Deſcent* muſt be underſtood according to the ſenſe of the *Scriptures*, this doth oblige no Man to any further neceſſity of belief of the ſenſe of the Article, than he is convinced, that it is the *ſenſe* of the *Scriptures*: And the caſe is the ſame, when the Article is expreſſed only in general Terms, which are known to be capable of very different *ſenſes*, when none of which are expreſſed, no particular ſenſe can be ſaid to be *neceſſary to Salvation*, to particular Perſons, but only that *ſenſe* in general, which all muſt agree in who own it, and the particulars are left to the *Convictions* of Men's Underſtandings upon the uſe of the beſt Means of Satisfaction. So that he that believes fully that the meaning of this Article from *Scripture*, is, that *Chriſt's Soul* did locally deſcend to Hell, it is neceſſary for him to believe ſo, upon ſuch Conviction; but he that ſees no more neceſſary to be believed by it, but that *Chriſt's Soul* was, during his Body's lying in the Grave, in a *State of Separation* from it; how can you prove it neceſſary to Salvation for him to believe any more than this? And the caſe is the ſame as to all *Modes* of *Exiſtence*, and particular Explications of Articles in themſelves owned, as of the different *Subſiſtences in the Trinity*, the manner of the *Hypoſtatical Union* of the *two Natures in Chriſt's Perſon*, ſuppoſing the Doctrines themſelves believed, what reaſon can there be to aſſert it neceſſary to Salvation to all Perſons, to believe them under ſuch a ſenſe, if the Article may be it ſelf believed without it, any further than as things under thoſe explications, are manifeſted to ſuch Perſons to be neceſſary to be believed? As *Leo* 3. defined in the Article of the *Holy Ghoſt's Proceſſion from the Son*, To ſuch, who by reaſon of capacity and apprehenſion, could attain to the knowledge of it, it was neceſſary to be believed, but not by others; as appears in our former Diſcourſe on that Subject. Therefore from hence we ſee another account, why things may become neceſſary to be believed and owned as ſuch, beſides the Matter and the Churches Definition. Theſe things may be ſaid to be neceſſary to be *believed* by ſuch, who believe the Churches Propoſition to be ſufficient, though it be not; as, ſuppoſe any Member of the *Greek Church* ſhould believe their Church infallible, it is neceſſary, for ſuch a one to believe whatever is propounded by that *Church*, though you ſuppoſe that judgment of his to be falſe in it ſelf, becauſe you ſay, the *Greek Church* is not infallible. So that from hence it appears, that the *neceſſity* ariſing from the *Churches* Definition, doth depend upon the Conviction, that whatever the *Church* defines, is neceſſary to be believed. And, where that is not received as an antecedent Principle, the other cannot be ſuppoſed. By this opening the ſeveral Grounds of *Neceſſity*, your difficulty concerning the *Athanaſian Creed* comes to nothing: For granting, that the *Church* of *England* doth own and approve the *Creed*, going under the name of *Athanaſius*, and ſuppoſing that her *Uſe* of the *Creed*, doth extend to the owning of thoſe Expreſſions, which import the *neceſſity* of believing the things therein contained in order to Salvation; yet this doth not reach to your purpoſe, unleſs you prove that the *Church* of *England* doth own that *neceſſity* purely on the account of the

Churches

Churches Definition of thoſe things which are not *Fundamental*, which it is very unreaſonable to imagine; it being directly contrary to her ſenſe in her nineteenth and twentieth Articles. And thence, that ſuppoſed *neceſſity* of the belief of the Articles of the *Athanaſian Creed*, muſt, according to the ſenſe of the *Church* of *England*, be reſolved either into the *neceſſity* of the *Matters*, or into that *neceſſity* which ſuppoſeth *clear Convictions*, that the things therein contained are of *Divine Revelation*. From hence then it cannot at all follow, becauſe the *Church* of *England* owns the *Creed* of *Athanaſius*, therefore all things defined by the *Church* are, *eo nomine*, *neceſſary to Salvation*. Other particulars concerning that *Creed*, as to its *Antiquity and Authority*, we may have occaſion afterwards more at large to diſcuſs; it ſufficeth now, that nothing is thence produced pertinent to the preſent Controverſie.

§. 15. N. 8. p. 31, 32. His Lordſhip, in the progreſs of this Diſcourſe, takes away that ſlight and poor Evaſion, *That the Declaration of the Church makes any thing Fundamental*, quoad nos, *becauſe that no reſpect to us can vary the Foundation. And that the Churches Declaration can bind us only to Peace and external Obedience, where there is not expreſs Letter of Scripture and Senſe agreed on: But it cannot make any thing Fundamental to us, that is not ſo in its own nature: For*, ſaith he, *if the Church can ſo add, that it can by a Declaration make a thing to be Fundamental in the Faith that was not, then it can take a thing away from this Foundation, and make it by declaring not to be—Fundamental, which all Men grant no Power of the Church can do. For the power of adding any thing contrary, and of detracting any thing neceſſary, are alike forbidden, and alike*

P. 18. *denied.* Now, you ſay, *That all this is ſatisfied by the foreſaid diſtinction, of material and formal Object*; and you deſire the Reader *to carry along with him this diſtinction of* objectum materiale & formale, materia atteſtata; & authoritas atteſtantis, *and he will eaſily diſcover the Fallacies of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, in this main Point of Controverſie, and ſolve all his Difficulties ſupported by them.* No doubt, an excellent *Amulet* to preſerve from the Infection of Reaſon! But it is your great Miſhap, that where you commend it ſo much, it doth you ſo little ſervice: For, let your diſtinction of *formal and material Object*, be ſuppoſed as ſound and good, as I have ſhewed it in your ſenſe, to be falſe and fallacious; yet it doth not reach that part of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, which you apply it to. For, ſtill his Reaſon is concluſive, though the neceſſity only be ſuppoſed to ariſe from the *Churches Authority*, yet if it be in the power of the *Church*, to make any thing neceſſary which was not, why may it not be equally in her power to make ſomething not neceſſary which was? For, either the grounds of the neceſſity of things to Salvation, doth depend on the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, as at firſt declared to the World, or it doth not. If it doth, then it is not in the *Churches Power* to make any thing neceſſary, which was not made neceſſary by it; if it doth not, then the *Church* may as well pretend to a power to make ſomething *not neceſſary*, which was; as to make ſomething neceſſary, which was not. So that your Diſtinction of *Formal and Material Object*, ſignifies nothing at all here, only this obſervable, that you make the *Churches Definition* to be the *Formal Object of Faith* here, which you very ſolemnly contradict afterwards. (*Cap.* 5. §. 4.) And can any thing be more evident from this Diſcourſe of yours, than that you make the laſt reſolution of Faith, as to the neceſſity of things to be believed into the *Churches Definition*, as its Formal Object? But this diſtinction with the grounds of it being removed in our former Diſcourſe, I ſhall eaſe my ſelf and the Reader of any further labour in examining what follows

lows in this Chapter, which depends wholly upon it; or elſe run out into *the Churches Infallibility, the infallible Aſſent requiſite to Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and our certainty* of it, or *the Authority of General Councils*; all which ſhall be fully and particularly examined in their proper places. There being nothing ſaid here, but what either hath been anſwered already, or will be more at large in a more convenient place. P. 19, 20, 21.

The only things remaining then in this Chapter, which deſerve a further diſcuſſion here, are the Teſtimonies of *Scotus* and St. *Auſtin*, and the Diſcourſes which depend thereon. For our better clearing the Teſtimony of *Scotus, in which you charge his Lordſhip with Falſification*, we muſt conſider on what account, and for what purpoſes that Teſtimony is produced. §. 16. His Lordſhip had ſaid before, *That Fundamentals are a Rock immoveable, and can never be varied; therefore what is fundamental after the Church hath defined it; was Fundamental before the definition, and no Decrees of Councils, how general ſoever, can alter immovable Verities; wherefore, if the Church in a Council define any thing, the thing defined is not fundamental becauſe the Church hath defined it; nor can be made ſo by the definition of the Church, if it be not ſo in it ſelf. For if the Church hath this Power, ſhe might make a New Article of Faith, which the learned among themſelves deny. For the Articles of Faith cannot increaſe in ſubſtance, but only in explication: For which he appeals to* Bellarmin. *Nor*, ſaith he, *Is this hard to be further proved out of your own School. For* Scotus *profeſſeth it in this very particular of the* Greek *Church. If there be*, ſaith he, *a true real difference between the* Greeks *and* Latins *about the Point of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, then either they or we be*, verè hæretici, *truly and indeed Hereticks. Which he ſpeaks of the old* Greeks *long before any Deciſion of the Church in this Controverſie. For he inſtances in St.* Baſil, *and* Greg. Nazianzen, *on one ſide; and St.* Jerome, Auguſtine, *and* Ambroſe, *on the other. And who dares call any of theſe Hereticks is his Challenge?* That then which his Lordſhip proves by this Teſtimony, is, that the *nature of Hereſie* doth not depend on the *Churches Definition*, but on the *Nature of the thing*; for, according to *Scotus*, antecedently to the *Churches Definition*, if there had been any real difference between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, one ſide of them had been *Hereticks*. P. 29. n. 5. N. 2. To this you anſwer, *That hence it follows not, that* Scotus *thought they could be Hereticks, unleſs they denied or doubted of that which they had reaſon to believe was revealed by God: But it only follows, that if they knew this (as thoſe learned* Greeks *had ſufficient reaſon to know it) they might well be eſteemed Hereticks, before any ſpecial Declaration of the Church; although it be more clear, that he is an Heretick, who denies to believe that Doctrine, after he confeſſes that it is defined by the Church.* From which anſwer of yours, ſeveral things are to our purpoſe obſervable. P. 21. 1. That the *Formal Reaſon* of *Hereſie*, is, denying ſomething ſuppoſed to be of *Divine Revelation*. 2. That none can reaſonably be accuſed of *Hereſie*, but ſuch as have ſufficient reaſon to believe that which they deny is *revealed by God*. 3. That none can be guilty of *Hereſie*, for denying any thing *declared by the Church*; unleſs they have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that whatever is declared by the *Church*, is *revealed by God*. Which unavoidably follows from the former, and therefore the *Churches Definition* cannot make any *Hereticks*, but ſuch as have reaſon to believe that ſhe cannot err in her *Definitions*. From whence *Proteſtants* will be in leſs danger of *Hereſie* than *Papiſts*, till you give us more ſufficient reaſons to prove, that whatever the *Church declares*, is certainly *revealed by God*. And, although you tell us, *Men may be accounted Hereticks before they are condemned as ſuch by General Councils, if they oppoſe*

poſe the Doctrine clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church; yet you tell us not, what the meaſures are, whereby we ought to judge what things are thus clearly contained in Scripture, or univerſally received; whether the *Churches judgment* muſt be taken, or every Man's own judgment: If the former, the ground of *Hereſie* lies ſtill in the *Churches Definition*, contrary to what *Scotus* affirms; if the latter, then no one can be an *Heretick*, but he that oppoſeth that which he is or may be convinced, is clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church. If *that which he is convinced*, then no Man is an *Heretick*, but he that goes againſt his preſent judgment, and ſo there will be few *Hereticks* in the World; *If that which he may be convinced of*, it muſt be underſtood either in *his* own judgment, or *yours*; if in *his own* judgment, then a *Heretick* is one who aſſents to things *raſhly*, without uſing means to inform himſelf: If in *yours*, why may not he ſay, You may as well be convinced of the *truth* of that which he believes, as he be convinced of the truth of that which you believe; and ſo you may be a *Heretick* to him by the ſame reaſon that he is to you. But you ſay further, *that there are many things, which in themſelves are Matters of Faith; yet ſo obſcure, in relation, eſpecially to unlearned and particular Perſons, that before the Decree of the Church, we are not Hereticks, though we ſhould either doubt of them, or deny them: becauſe, as yet, there appears no ſufficient reaſon that can oblige us to believe them; although, after the Definition of the Church, we ought as well to believe them as any other.* But it is impoſſible to underſtand how there can be ſuch things which Men might ſafely not believe, but upon the Definition of the Church they are bound to believe them neceſſarily, unleſs it be clear to them, that the Church hath power to make obſcure things plain, and unneceſſary things to become neceſſary. For, ſuppoſe one of theſe *obſcure things* be this very *Power* of the *Church in defining* ſuch things, while this remains ſo *obſcure*, you tell me I may not doubt or disbelieve it without Hereſie, and while I do ſo, I may certainly doubt or disbelieve all ſhe declares But, by what means ſhall this thing become *clear?* Muſt it be by the *Churches* defining it? But that very *Power* of *defining*, is the thing in queſtion and therefore cannot be cleared by it. And if there be any thing then ſo obſcure, that Men may without Sin doubt of it, or disbelieve it, certainly the *Churches Power in defining Matters of Faith*, is ſuch; it being not capable by any Act of the *Church*, of being made ſo clear, as to oblige Men to believe it.

But we muſt ſee how his *Lordſhip* hath wronged the *Teſtimony* of *Scotus*: *For firſt*, ſay you, *He would perſwade his Reader, that this Author ſuppoſed a real difference between the Ancient* Greek *and* Latin *Fathers, about the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; whereas* Scotus *declares, that there was no real difference between them*: But doth his Lordſhip ſay, there was? Doth he not expreſly cite *Scotus* his Teſtimony in an hypothetical manner; *If there be a true real difference, &c.* and it is evident from *Scotus* his words, that he ſuppoſeth, *If the difference had been real, that either the* Greeks *or* Latins *were truly Hereticks.* And therefore you are guilty of a much greater Injury to his *Lordſhip* than he was to *Scotus*. Again, you ſay, *He wrongs him, in ſaying, That after the Churches Definition, it becomes of the ſubſtance of Faith.* Now, ſay you, *Scotus hath not one word of the Subſtance of Faith, much leſs of Fundamental, which he impoſes preſently upon him, but ſays only thus*, Ex quo Eccleſia declavarit hoc eſſe tenendum, *&c.* tenendum eſt, quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ab utroque, *Since the Church hath ſo declared, ſo it muſt be held.* Sure you never expect to be believed,

Pateret utiq; tandem, ipſam contrarietatem non eſſe veraciter realem, ſicut eſt vocalis, alioquin vel ipſi Græci, vel nos Latini ſumus verè hæretici. Scotus Diſt. 11. l. 1. q. 1. ſect. 2.

lieved, but by a very implicit Faith; for if one doth but offer to search an Author, your Jugling becomes notorious. Had you the confidence to say, That *Scotus* has not one word of the *Substance of Faith*; I pray who made that *&c.* for you in the Sentence? If you did it your self, you *abuse* your Readers; if another did it for you, he *abused* you: For that very *&c.* leaves out those words, *sicut de substantia fidei*, and try if you can render that otherwise, than *as of the Substance of Faith*; to manifest your *Forgery*, the whole place is cited in the Margin. Is this your Fidelity in quoting Authors, even when you charge others with wronging them? It may be you will say yet, That *Scotus doth not say, it is to be held*, sicut de substantia fidei, though it be declared by the Church to be so held! But what means then the *ex quo*, if Men's Faith must not be guided by the *Churches Declaration*: For if it be therefore to be believed necessarily, because declared by the Church, it must be believed as it is declared by the Church: If therefore the Church declares that it is to be held *as of the Substance of Faith*, it ought to be held so by such as are bound to believe it on the Churches Declaration. Besides, you will not say, but that it was to be believed before; now, what alteration is caused by the Declaration of the Church, but this, That which was before to be believed simply and in it self, is now to be believed on the account of the Churches Declaration, as of the Substance of Faith. And thus it is impossible to relieve your self with your old Shift of *Material and formal Object*, which you betake your self to. Thus still we see you are that most unhappy Person, who never begin a Charge against your Adversary, but it falls back most unevitably upon your self, who so readily make use of Forgeries, to prove others guilty of them.

Quicquid sit de iis ex quo Ecclesia Catholica declaravit hoc esse tenendum, sicut de substantia fidei, sicut patet extra. de sum. Trin. & fid. Cath. c. *firmiter tenendum est quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ab utroq;.* Scotus. ib.

Upon *Scotus* his mentioning the *Churches Declaration*, his *Lordship* enquires, *What this Declaration is, and how far it extends.* For which, his Lordship saith, *The Master teacheth, and his Scholars too, that every thing which belongs to the Exposition or Declaration of another*, intus est, *is not another contrary thing, but is contained within the bowels and nature of that which is interpreted: From which, if the Declaration depart, it is faulty and erroneous, because, instead of declaring, it gives another and contrary sense. Therefore when the Church declares any thing in Council, either that which she declares was* intus *or* extra; *in the nature and verity of the thing, or out of it. If it were* extra, *without the nature of the thing declared, then the Declaration of the thing is false; and so far from being Fundamental in the Faith. If it were* intus, *within the nature and compass of the thing, though not open and apparent to every eye; then the Declaration is true, but not otherwise Fundamental than the thing is which is declared: For that which is* intus, *cannot be larger or deeper, than that in which it is; if it were, it could not be* intus. *Therefore nothing is simply Fundamental, because the Church declares it; but because it is so, in the nature of the thing which the Church declares.* In answer to this, you seem more ingenuous than usual; for you acknowledge, *that his expression is learnedly solid and good:* But yet you would seem to return some answer to this Argument, *viz. although there be no alteration in the nature of the Articles by the Churches Declaration; yet this doth not hinder them from becoming Fundamental in that sense in which we dispute*, i. e. *such as cannot be denied or doubted of under pain of Damnation, although they were not thus Fundamental before the Declaration, as not being so clearly proposed to us, as that we were bound to believe them. Neither doth this take away any thing from their* intus, *or that Being which they had of themselves; but only gives a certainty of their being*

§. 17. P. 31. n. 7.

P. 23.

ſo, and declares that they ought to be ſo quoad nos, *as well as* quoad ſe, *and internally. And it is no evaſion, but a ſolid diſtinction, that the Declaration of the*
P. 24. *Church varies not the thing in it ſelf, but* quoad nos *in its reſpect to us.* The ſubſtance of your Anſwer lies in this, That though the *Church* by her Declaration, doth not alter the nature of things, yet ſhe may, and doth, our *Obligation to believe them*; ſo that ſuch things which Men might have been ſaved without believing before, when once the Church hath declared them, become neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation. And
P. 20. B. 8. yet you would not have this called *making new Articles of Faith:* But I pray tell us, what you mean by *Articles of Faith*; are not thoſe properly Articles of Faith, as diſtinct from *Theological Verities*, which are neceſſary to be believed by all? If therefore thoſe things which the Church declares, were before not neceſſary, and by the *Churches Declaration* do become neceſſary; then certainly thoſe things which were not *Articles of Faith*, do become Articles of Faith, and what then doth the Church by her Declaration, but make New Articles of Faith? But, though you aſſert the thing, you like not the Terms, becauſe they do not ſound ſo pleaſantly to the Ears of Chriſtians, who believe all *Obligation to Faith* doth depend upon immediate Divine Revelation. Setting aſide therefore the terms, let us examine the thing, to ſee upon what Grounds the *Church* can make that neceſſary to us, which was not in it ſelf. In which caſe the *Obligation* not ariſing from the neceſſity of the *Matter* in it ſelf to be believed, it is no otherwiſe intelligible, but that it muſt reſult from the ſuppoſition of ſome *Immediate Revelation.* For nothing elſe can bind us to an *Internal Aſſent*, which you require as neceſſary to the Churches Definitions but that, unleſs you can ſhew how any Society of Men conſidered as ſuch, have power to *oblige* all other Men to believe what they declare on pain of Damnation for not doing it. I pray tell me, whether the *Apoſtles* themſelves had power to bind all *Chriſtians* to the belief of ſomething as neceſſary, which the *Spirit of God* did not immediately reveal to them to be ſo? If not, what Power can any *Church* have to do it, without a greater meaſure of *Infallibility*, than the *Apoſtles* ever pretended to? For, they never attempted to define any thing as neceſſary, which was ſuppoſed unneceſſary to be believed after the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel* was declared to the World. Before then you can perſwade us to believe that your *Church* can make any thing *neceſſary*, which was *not ſo*, you muſt prove an *Abſolute Infallible Divine Aſſiſtance of God's Spirit* with your *Church*, in whatever ſhe ſhall attempt to declare or define as Matter of Faith. As for inſtance, ſuppoſing it not neceſſary to Salvation in it ſelf to believe the *Immaculate Conception* of the *Virgin Mary*, how is it poſſible to conceive, after your *Churches Definition* of it, it ſhould become neceſſary, unleſs it be ſuppoſed that there was an *Immediate Divine Revelation*, in that Definition. For, nothing but *Divine Authority* commanding our Aſſent, the Ground of Faith muſt be reſolved into that. Now in this caſe, beſides the Immediate Aſſent to the thing declared as a Truth, there is a diſtinct Propoſition to be *believed*, which is, That *what was not before neceſſary to be believed, doth now become neceſſary to be believed by all*; and ſhews us, either that there is *Divine Revelation* for this, or elſe excuſe us, that we cannot give an *Internal Aſſent* to it. For, we have not learnt to give an Aſſent of Faith to a meer humane Propoſition, or, in our *Saviour's* words, we call no Man, *Maſter upon Earth*, ſo as to promiſe to believe it in the power of any Church whatſoever, to make any thing neceſſary to be believed, which was not ſo before. Hence it appears, that your Diſtinction of, *in ſe*, & *quoad nos*, is as inſigni-

ſignificant, as your pretence of the Churches Power to define Matters of Faith is preſumptuous and arrogant, being the higheſt degree of *Lording it over the Chriſtian World.*

Why your Church may not as well declare ſomething not to be of *Faith*, which before was of Faith, as declare ſomething to be of Faith which before was not of Faith, it is not eaſie to apprehend, if that thing might be ſuppoſed of Faith before, without the Churches explicit Declaration. For in that caſe the Church would not ſo apparently contradict her ſelf; for that *Contradiction* doth not lie in varying the reſpects of things, but in one Declaration contradicting another. For otherwiſe, it is as great a contradiction to ſay, That ſomething which was not neceſſary, is become neceſſary; as that a thing which was neceſſary, is become not neceſſary. Therefore if there be a contradiction in one, there is in the other. If the Contradiction lies in the *Declaration*, you muſt ſay, That nothing could be ſuppoſed neceſſary to be *believed*, but what was declared by the *Church* to be ſo, and as declared by the *Church*: Which is a Province as difficult as neceſſary to be undertaken, to rid your hands of this Difficulty. For otherwiſe, that Anſwer of yours cannot reach the Objection. P. 24.

And now we come to that *Teſtimony* of St. *Auguſtine*, which was produced to prove, *That all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental:* Which ſay, *It is a thing founded. An erring Diſputant is to be born with in other Queſtions, not diligently digeſted, not yet made firm by full Authority of the Church; there error is to be born with: But it ought not to proceed ſo far, that it ſhould labour to ſhake the Foundation it ſelf of the Church.* Now to this place his Lordſhip anſwers.

Fundata iſta res eſt; ferendus eſt diſputator errans in aliis quæſtionibus, non diligenter digeſtis, nondum plena eccleſiæ autoritate firmatis, ibi ferendus eſt error: non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam Fundamentum ipſum Eccleſiæ quatere moliatur. Auguſt. ſerm. 14. de verb. Apoſtol. Tom. 10. p. 224. edit. Froben. 1529.

1. *He ſpeaks of a Foundation of Doctrine in Scripture, not of a Church-Definition: This appears*, ſaith he, *For few lines before, he tells us, There was a Queſtion moved to St.* Cyprian, *Whether Baptiſm was concluded to the eighth day, as well as Circumciſion? And, no doubt was made then of the beginning of Sin; and that out of this thing, about which no Queſtion was moved, that Queſtion that was made was anſwered. And again, that St.* Cyprian *took that which he gave in anſwer from the Foundation of the Church, to confirm a Stone that was ſhaking. Now St.* Cyprian *in all the Anſwer that he gives, hath not one word of any definition of the Church: Therefore ea res, that thing by which he anſwered was a Foundation of prime and ſettled Scripture-Doctrine, not any Definition of the Church: Therefore that which he took out of the Foundation of the Church, to faſten the Stone that ſhook, was not Definition of the Church, but the Foundation of the Church it ſelf, the Scripture upon which it is builded; as appeareth in the* Milevitan *Councils; where the Rule by which* Pelagius *was condemned, is the Rule of Scripture. Therefore St.* Auguſtine *goes on in the ſame ſenſe, that the Diſputer is not to be born any longer, that ſhall endeavour to ſhake the Foundation it ſelf, upon which the whole Church is grounded.* P. 32, 33. n. 9, 10.

2. His Lordſhip anſwers, *That granting that the Churches Definition, was meant by St.* Auſtin, *yet it can never follow out of any, or all theſe Circumſtances, that all Points defined by the Church are Fundamental, becauſe this Foundation may be upon humane Authority; and that which follows, only is, That things are not to be oppoſed, which are made firm by full Authority of the Church; but it cannot be thence concluded, They are therefore Fundamental in the Faith.* This is the ſubſtance of his Lordſhip's Anſwer to this place; which we muſt conſider what you reply to. Firſt, you ſay, *That it cannot be doubted but that St.* Auſtin's *judgment was, that all our Faith depended on the* Pag. 25.

Authority of the Church, and therefore that he that oppoſeth himſelf againſt this, endeavoureth to ſhake and deſtroy the very Ground-work of all Divine Supernatural Faith. This is a rare way of ſilencing Adverſaries, by telling them, *That cannot be doubted*, which others can ſee no reaſon at all to believe. As in this preſent caſe you tell me, that cannot be doubted, which I utterly deny, *viz.* That St. *Auſtin*'s judgment was, that all our *Faith* depended on the *Authority of the Church*; and if all the proof you have for it, be only that well-known place, *Ergo verò Evangelio non crederem, &c.* You ſhall in time ſee, what an ill choice you made of fixing your proof wholly upon that. But whoever is never ſo little converſant in St. *Auguſtine*'s way of diſputing either againſt the *Donatiſts*, *Pelagians*, or *Manichees*, will find very little reaſon to doubt, but that he made the *Foundation of Faith*, to be *God's Word*, and not the *Authority* of the *Church*. Indeed S. *Auſtin*, by way of *Preſcription*, often makes uſe of the *Churches Authority*, not where there hath been particular *Definitions*, but *Univerſal Conſent*, which he underſtands by the ſettlement, by *full Authority of the Church*; but this he inſiſts not on as the ground of Faith, but to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of Men's oppoſing thoſe things which the *Univerſal Church* was agreed in, as in this Controverſie here diſputed by him concerning *Original Sin in Infants*. Therefore if I underſtand S. *Auſtin* in this place, he doth not at all ſpeak concerning what is to be owned as a Matter of Faith ſimply in it ſelf, but what the *Churches Carriage* towards Diſſenters is. For after that *Citation* of St. *Cyprian* at the Concluſion of his Sermon, he addreſſeth himſelf to the *Pelagians*, as his diſſenting Brethren; Therefore, ſaith he, *Let us, if poſſible, intreat this of our Brethren, That they would no longer call us Hereticks; becauſe we might as well call them ſo if we would, but we do not.* Why was St. *Auſtin* ſo ſcrupulous of calling the *Pelagians Hereticks*, if he made the *Definition* of the *Church* the Foundation of Faith, and looked on this Controverſie as defined by full Authority of the *Church?* And after, ſpeaks of the *Churches* bearing with them ſtill, in order to their inſtruction; though they were gone ſo far, that they were ſcarce to be born with; and that the *Church* exerciſed great patience towards them; therefore intreats them not to abuſe this *Patience* of the *Church*, but to be *reformed*, ſince they did exhort as *Friends*, and not contend as Enemies. And ſo brings in the former words, which I thus paraphraſe; *It is a thing to be taken for granted, that in diſputable Points, and ſuch as the Church hath not always been agreed in, Diſſenters may be born with: But if direct and full oppoſition to the clear ſenſe of the Church ſhould ſtill be ſuffered, it would overthrow the very Foundation of the Church it ſelf.* And that this, and no other, is the plain and genuine meaning of St. *Auſtin*, is evident to any one who impartially conſiders Antecedents and Conſequents, and the natural ſenſe of the words themſelves. Before, he ſpake how far the Church had born with them: in the words themſelves, he tells them, They muſt not expect the *Church* would always bear with them, if they joined *Obſtinacy* with their *Errors*, for that would ruine the *Church*, if ſhe continually ſuffered ſuch as violently oppoſed things contrary to her cleareſt ſenſe: And after tells them, *This is not expedient: For hitherto, it may be, our patience is not to be found fault withal; but we ought likewiſe to fear, leſt we be blamed for our negligence:* Which words immediately follow the former. And is not this now a rare conſequence, If the *Church* muſt not always bear with ſuch as oppoſe her, then whatſoever is defined by the Church is Fundamental? For it

Impetremus ergo, ſi poſſumus, à fratribus noſtris, ne nos inſuper appellent Hæreticos; quod eos talia diſputantes nos appellare poſſimus forſitan, ſi vellemus, nec tamen appellamus, Id. ib.

Non expedit: adhuc fortè noſtra non eſt reprehendenda patientia; ſed debemus timere, ne culpetur etiam negligentia.

is

is moſt evident, St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks not of the *Churches Power*, in defining Matters of Faith, but of the *Churches proceeding with obſtinate Heretick*s. And therefore the *Foundation* ſpoken of, is not the *Foundation* of her *Belief*, but of her *Communion*; which the continual bearing with ſuch obſtinate Perſons as the *Pelagians* were, would in time overthrow. The want of underſtanding this to be St. *Auguſtine*'s meaning, hath made you ſpend many words to very little purpoſe, ſuppoſing all along that he ſpeaks of the *Churches Definition*, and not her proceedings. Your Reply to his Lordſhip's ſecond Anſwer, runs upon the ſame miſtake, that he ſpeaks of *Shaking the Foundation of Faith*, whereas I have already ſhewed, that he ſpeaks of no ſuch thing, and therefore that, as well as the former Anſwer, fall to the ground together, being both built on the ſame *miſtaken Foundation*.

CHAP. III.

The Abſurdities of the *Romaniſts* Doctrine of Fundamentals.

The Churches Authority muſt be Divine, if whatever ſhe defines be Fundamental. His Lordſhip, and not the Teſtimony of St. Auguſtine, *ſhamefully abuſed, three ſeveral ways.* Bellarmine *not miſ-cited*; *the* Pelagian *Hereſie condemned by the General Council at* Epheſus. *The Pope's Authority not implied in that of Councils. The groſs Abſurdities of the diſtinction of the Church teaching and repreſentative, from the Church taught and diffuſive, in the Queſtion of Fundamentals. The Churches Authority and Teſtimony in Matters of Faith, diſtinguiſhed. The Teſtimonies of* Vincentius Lerinenſis *explained, and ſhewed to be directly contrary to the* Roman *Doctrine of Fundamentals.* Stapleton *and* Bellarmine *not reconciled by the vain endeavours uſed to that end.*

§. 1. THE main Doctrine of *Fundamentals* being in the foregoing Chapter ſettled and cleared, what remains of that ſubject will be capable of a quicker diſpatch. The ſcope of this *Chapter*, is, to aſſoil thoſe Difficulties, which your Doctrine of *Fundamentals* is ſubject to. What little footing that hath in the place of St. *Auguſtine*, was the laſt thing diſcuſſed in the preceeding Chapter; and therefore muſt not be repeated here. His Lordſhip urgeth this reaſon, why St. *Auguſtine*, or any other reaſonable Man could not believe, that whatever is defined by the Church is *Fundamental in the Faith*; P. 34. n. 11. *becauſe full Church-Authority (always the time that included the Holy Apoſtles being paſt by, and not comprehended in it) is but Church-Authority; and Church-Authority, when it is at full Sea, is not ſimply Divine; therefore the ſentence of it not Fundamental in the Faith.* To this you very wiſely and learnedly anſwer, *I will not diſpute with his Lordſhip, whether it be, or no; becauſe it is* P. 28. n. 1. *ſufficient that ſuch Authority be infallible. For if it be infallible, it cannot propoſe to us any thing as revealed by God, but what is ſo revealed. So that to diſpute againſt this Authority, is in effect to take away all Authority from Divine Revelation; we having no other abſolute certainty, that this or that is revealed by God, but only the Infallibility of the Church propoſing, or atteſting it unto us as revealed. Whence alſo it follows, that to doubt, diſpute againſt, or deny any thing that is propoſed by the Infallible Authority of the Church, is to doubt, diſpute againſt, and deny that which is Fundamental in Faith.* His Lordſhip denies the Sentence of the Church to be Fundamental in the Faith, becauſe *not Divine*; you dare not ſay, It is *Divine* but contend that it is *Infallible*, and from that Infallibility infer, That *Whoſoever denies the Churches Infallibility*,

libility, muſt deny ſomething Fundamental in the Faith, becauſe we can have no other abſolute certainty that any thing is revealed by God, but only from the Churches Infallibility. So that your whole Proof reſts upon a very rotten and uncertain Foundation, *viz.* that all *certainty* in Matters of Faith, doth depend upon the *Churches Infallibility*; the falſhood and unreaſonableneſs of which Principle, will at large be diſcovered in the ſucceeding Controverſie. And if this falls, then the denial of the Churches Infallibility doth not infer the denial of any thing *Fundamental* in the Faith, becauſe Men may be certain of all *Fundamentals*, without believing this Infallibility. But yet, ſay you, *There is no neceſſity of aſſerting Church-Authority to be Divine, but only to be infallible, in order to the making what ſhe defines to be Fundamental.* A rare and excellent piece of your old *Theological Reaſon!* as though any thing could be any further *Infallible* than it is *Divine*, or any further owned to be *Divine*, than as it is *Infallible.* I pray, acquaint us with theſe rare Arts of diſtinguiſhing between an Authority *Divine* and *Infallible*, when the ground of that *Infallibility*, is the ſuppoſition of ſomething properly and ſimply *Divine*, which is the *Infallible Aſſiſtance* of *God's Spirit.* Is that Aſſiſtance *Infallible* too, but not *Divine?* If it be *Divine*, as well as *Infallible*, how comes that *Infallibility* which flows from it not to be *Divine*, when the cauſe of it was ſimply and abſolutely ſo? Beſides, what *Infallible Authority* is that which makes all its *Definitions Fundamental*, and yet is not in it ſelf *Divine?* From whence comes any thing to be *Fundamental?* You tell us your ſelf, *as it is known to be revealed by God.* And can any thing be known to be revealed by God, but by an *Authority Divine?* Eſpecially on your Principles, who make all certainty of knowing it to depend on that Churches Authority? If ſo, then ſince the Churches Sentence makes things become Matters of Faith, ſome things may become Matters of Faith, which have no *Divine Authority* for them. But this excellent and ſubtle diſtinction between *Divine* and *Infallible Authority*, we ſhall have occaſion to examine afterwards. And therefore it is well you tell us, *Notwithſtanding the Infallible and Divine, ſeem to many great Divines to be terms convertible*, which only acquaints us with thus much, that there are ſome Men who underſtand things better than you do; and that to do ſo, is to be a *great Divine.* And if *Stapleton* be one of theſe, we are not much offended at it; and ſo far we will take the Teſtimonies which you produce out of him.—That which next follows depends upon the Proof of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, which when you have ſufficiently cleared, we will believe that there can be no plain *Scripture*, or *evident Reaſon* againſt any of their *Definitions*, but till then we muſt believe there may be room for both.

§. 2. Your next *Section* promiſeth to ſhew us *a ſhameful Abuſe of St.* Auguſtine's *Teſtimony three ſeveral ways*; but, if it appears, that not one of thoſe ways will hold, then it only follows, that ſo many ways *you* have abuſed his *Lordſhip*, and not *he* St. *Auguſtine.* His *Lordſhip* having affirmed,

P. 32. n. 11. *That plain Scripture with evident ſenſe, or a full demonſtrative Argument, muſt have room, where a wrangling and erring Diſputer may not be allowed it. And there's neither of theſe but may convince the Definition of the Council, if it be ill founded.* Over againſt theſe words he cites that ſentence of St. *Auſtin*; *Aug. contra ep. Fundam. c. 4.* *Quæ quidem ſi tam manifeſta monſtratur, ut in dubium venire non poſſit, præponenda eſt omnibus illis rebus, quibus in Catholicâ teneor. Ita ſi aliquid apertiſſimum in Evangelio, &c.* The plain meaning of which words of St. *Auguſtine*, is, *That evident Truth is to be preferred before all Church-Authority*: Now a threefold Exception you take to his Lordſhip's inſiſting on this Teſtimony. P. 30. 1. *That St.* Auſtin *ſpeaks not either of plain Scripture, or evident ſenſe,*

ſenſe, or of a full demonſtrative Argument ; but addreſſing his Speech to the Manicheans, *he writes thus,* Apud vos autem ubi nihil horum eſt quod me invitet ac teneat, ſola perſonat veritatis pollicitatio *(and then follow the words cited by the Biſhop)* quæ quidem ſi tam manifeſta monſtratur ; *where it is plain* quæ, *which, is relative only to Truth, and not to Scripture, or any thing elſe.* A wonderful abuſe of St. *Auſtin* to make him parallel *plain Scripture, evident Senſe,* or a *full demonſtrative Argument* with *Truth!* As though if *evident Truth* were more prevalent with him than all thoſe Arguments which held him in the *Catholick Church, plain Scripture, evident Senſe,* or *Demonſtrations* would not be ſo too. What Truth can be evident, if it be not one of theſe three? Do you think, there is any other way of manifeſting *Truth,* but by *Scripture, Senſe,* or *Demonſtration?* If you have found out other ways, oblige the World by communicating them ; but till then, give us leave to think, that it is all one to ſay, *Manifeſt Truth,* as plain Scripture, evident Senſe, or clear Demonſtrations. But, ſay, you, *He ſpeaks only of that Truth which the* Manichees *bragged of, and promiſed:* As though St. *Auſtin* would have been perſwaded ſooner as it came from them, than as it was *Truth* in it ſelf. I ſuppoſe, St. *Auſtin* did not think their Teſtimony ſufficient, and therefore ſays, *Quæ quidem ſi tam manifeſta monſtratur,* &c. *i. e.* If they could make that which they ſaid, evident to be Truth, he would quit the *Church,* and adhere to them: And if this holds againſt the *Manichees,* will it not on the ſame reaſon hold every where elſe, *viz.* That manifeſt Truth is not to be quitted on any Authority whatſoever? Which is all his *Lordſhip* aſſerts.

But, *You offer to prove that St.* Auſtin, *by* Truth, *could not mean* plain Scripture ; But can you prove, that by *Truth,* he did not mean *Truth,* wherever he found it, whether in Scripture, or elſewhere? *No,* ſay you, *It cannot be meant, that by Truth, he ſhould mean plain Scripture, in oppoſition to the Definitions of the Catholick Church, or General Councils* ; For which you give this Reaſon, *becauſe he ſuppoſes it impoſſible, that the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, ſhould be contrary to Scripture ; for then Men, according to St.* Auſtin, *ſhould not believe infallibly, either the one or the other. Not the Scriptures, becauſe they are received only upon the Authority of the Church ; nor the Church, whoſe Authority is infringed by the plain Scripture which is brought againſt her.* For which you produce a large Citation out of St. *Auſtin* to that purpoſe. But the Anſwer to that is eaſie. For St. *Auſtin,* when he ſpeaks of *Church-Authority, quâ infirmatâ jam nec Evangelio credere potero* ; he doth not in the leaſt underſtand it of any *Definitions* of the *Church* ; but of the *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Catholick Church* concerning the *Scriptures* from the time of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles.* And what plain *Scriptures* thoſe are ſuppoſable, which ſhould contradict ſuch a *Tradition* as this is, is not eaſie to underſtand. But the caſe is quite otherwiſe as to the *Churches Definitions* ; for neither doth the Authority of *Scripture* at all reſt upon them ; and there may be very well ſuppoſed ſome plain *Scriptures* contrary to the *Churches Definitions,* unleſs it be proved, that the *Church* is abſolutely infallible, and the very proof of that depending on *Scripture,* there muſt be an appeal made to plain *Scripture,* whether the Churches Definitions may not be contradicted by *Scripture.* When therefore you ſay, *This is an impoſſible Suppoſition, that Scripture ſhould contradict the Churches Definitions, like that of the Apoſtle ; If an Angel from Heaven teach otherwiſe, let him be accurſed,* Gal. 1. You muſt prove it as impoſſible for the Church to deviate from *Scripture* in any of her Definitions, *as for an Angel to Preach another Goſpel* ; which will be the braver attempt, becauſe it ſeems ſo little befriended either by Senſe or Rea-

C. ep. Fund. c. 5.

ſon.

ſion. But, ſay you, *If the Church may be an erring Definer, I would gladly know, why an erring Diſputer may not oppugn her.* That which you would ſo gladly know, is not very difficult to be reſolved, by any one who underſtands the great difference between yielding an *Internal Aſſent* to the *Definitions* of the *Church*, and *open oppoſing* them; for it only follows from the poſſibility of the *Churches* Error in defining, that therefore we ought not to yield an *abſolute Internal Aſſent* to all her Determinations, but muſt examine them by the beſt Meaſures of Truth, in order to our full Aſſent to them: But, though the *Church may err*, it doth not therefore follow, that it is lawful in all Caſes, or for all Perſons, to oppugn her Definitions, eſpecially if thoſe Definitions be only in order to the *Churches Peace*: But if they be ſuch as require Internal Aſſent to them, then plain Scripture, evidence of Senſe, or clear Reaſon, may be ſufficient cauſe to hinder the ſubmitting to thoſe Definitions.

Ibidem. 2. You tell us, *That his Lordſhip hath abuſed St.* Auſtin's *Teſtimony, becauſe he ſpeaks not of the Definitions of the Church, in Matters not Fundamental, according to the Matter they contain; but the Truth mentioned by him was Fundamental in its Matter.* This is the Subſtance of your ſecond Anſwer, which is very rational and prudent, being built on this ſubſtantial Evidence. If St. *Auſtin* doth prefer manifeſt Truth before things ſuppoſed *Fundamental in the Matter*, then, no doubt, St. *Auſtin* would not prefer manifeſt Truth, before things ſuppoſed not Fundamental in the Matter. And do not you think this enough to charge his Lordſhip with ſhamefully abuſing St. *Auſtin?* But certainly, if St. *Auſtin* preferred manifeſt Truth before that which was greater, would he not do it before that which was incomparably leſs? If he did it before all thoſe things which kept him in the *Catholick Church*, ſuch as the conſent of Nations, Miracles, Univerſal Tradition, which he mentions before; do you think he would have ſcrupled to have done it, as to any particular *Definitions* of the *Church?* Theſe are therefore very excellent ways of vindicating the *Fathers* Teſtimonies, from having any thing of Senſe or Reaſon in them.

§. 3. 3. You ſay, *He hath abuſed* St. *Auſtin, by putting in a wrangling Diſputer:* But I wonder where his Lordſhip ever ſays, that St. *Auſtin* mentions any ſuch in the Teſtimony cited. For his words are theſe. *But plain Scripture, with evident Senſe, or a full demonſtrative Argument muſt have room, where a wrangling and erring Diſputer may not be allowed it. And there's neither of theſe* (over againſt theſe words, he refers to St. *Auſtin*'s Teſtimony, and not the foregoing) *but may convince the Definition of the Council, if it be ill founded.* When you therefore ask, *Where the wrangling Diſputer is to be found*; had it not been for the help of this Cavil, we might have been to ſeek for him. But when you have been enquiring for him, at laſt you cry out, εὕρηκα, *Oh! I ſee now:* And you are the fitteſt Man to find him out
p. 32. that I know. You ſay, *This is done to diſtinguiſh him from ſuch a Diſputer as proceeds ſolidly and demonſtratively againſt the Definitions of the Church, when they are ill founded; which St.* Auſtin *is ſo far from ſuppoſing that one may do, that he judges him a mad Man, who diſputes againſt any thing* quod univerſa Eccleſia ſentit; *and that they have Hearts, not only of Stone, but even of Devils, who reſiſt ſo great a Manifeſtation of Truth, as is made by an Oecumenical Council, for of that he ſpeaks.* Your deſign is to prove, that St. *Auſtin* doth not admit of any plea from *Scripture, Senſe*, or *Reaſon*, againſt any Definitions of the *Church*, for which you firſt produce that known place in which St. *Auſtin* accounts it madneſs to oppoſe the univerſal Practices of the Church, which will hold for your purpoſe, as far as Rites and Matters of Faith have

have any Analogy with each other; your latter Teſtimony ſeems more to the purpoſe to all Perſons who do not examine it, and to none elſe. For, although you ſeemed very careful to prevent any examination of the place by a falſe Citation of *Epiſt.* 153, for 152. yet that hath not hindred my diſcovering your *Fraud*, in aſſerting, that St. *Auſtin* there ſpeaks of an *Oecumenical Council.* For there is not ſo much as any thing like it in that *Epiſtle.* I acknowledge thoſe words to be found there which you produce, *Nulla excuſatio jam remanſit: nimium dura, nimium diabolica ſunt hominum corda, quæ adhuc tantæ manifeſtationi veritatis obſiſtunt.* But there needs no more to confute the moſt of your Teſtimonies out of the *Fathers*, but to mention the occaſion of their being produced, or the ſcope and deſign of the *Authors*, as is moſt evident in this place. For this *Epiſtle* is written in the Name of *Silvanus*, *Valentinus*, *Aurelius*, *Innocentius*, *Maximinus*, *Optatus*, *Auguſtinus*, *Donatus*, and other *Biſhops*, for ſatisfaction of the *Donatiſts* concerning the proceedings at the *Council* of *Carthage*; for the *Donatiſt Biſhops* being therein baffled, had diſperſed among their *Proſelytes* many falſe Rumours of that *Council*, and of their being circumvented by their *Catholick* Adverſaries. To diſprove which in this Epiſtle, they firſt ſhew the Fraud and Falſity of the *Donatiſts*, and then the *Integrity* of their own proceedings, by the choice of ſeven Perſons on either ſide, who ſhould ſpeak in behalf of the reſt; and ſeven others as Counſellors to them; and four Notaries on either ſide, and four other Perſons who ſhould keep the *Records* to prevent all Fraud. Beſides all this, every one was to ſubſcribe in his own words, that no Man might complain that any thing was corrupted afterwards; which things being diſperſed, while the Perſons themſelves lived, there was no probability Poſterity ſhould be deceived in the report of them. And then follow thoſe words; *That no Excuſe hath now been left, but that their Hearts are too hard and Diabolical, who could gainſay ſo clear a manifeſtation of Truth.* Is it not now a rare Conſequence from hence to infer, That it is not lawful upon any ground of *Scripture*, *Senſe*, or *Reaſon*, to diſpute the *Definitions* of *General Councils?* Whereas no ſuch thing was ever mentioned as a *General Council*, as appears by the very next words, where he ſays expreſly, it was only a *Council of* African *Biſhops*; and elſewhere St. *Auſtin* tells the *Donatiſts*, that they never durſt appeal to a *General Council.* And ſuppoſing the *Council* never ſo *Oecumenical*, he mentions nothing of the *Definitions* of it, but the manner of its proceedings. So that the greateſt Truth hereby manifeſted, is, your deſign to abuſe his Lordſhip and the Reader together.

Ecce putemus illos Epiſcopos qui Romæ judicarunt, non bonos judices fuiſſe, teſtabat adhuc plenarium Eccleſiæ univerſæ Concilium, ubi etiam cum ipſis judicibus cauſa poſſet agitari, ut ſi male judicaſſe convicti eſſent, eorum ſententiæ ſolverentur. Quod utrum fecerint, probent. Nos enim non factum eſſe facile probamus, ex eo quod totus orbis non iis communicat. Aug. Epiſt. 162.

Since you diſown the diſtinction of *things being Fundamental in the matter and in the manner*, I ſhall not trouble you with ſhewing you the weakneſs of it: But it were eaſie to manifeſt it as good as that you embrace of the *Material and Formal Object*, which hath been ſufficiently refuted in the precedent Chapter, and I have no leiſure for Repetitions. §. 4.

His Lordſhip endeavouring further to ſhew, *What little Foundation your Doctrine of Fundamentals hath in the forecited place of St.* Auguſtine; *urgeth this as an Argument againſt it, That if all Points defined by the Church, are therefore Fundamental, becauſe that is not to be ſhaken, which is ſettled by full Authority of the Church; then it muſt follow, That the Point there ſpoken of, the remiſſion of Original Sin, in the Baptiſm of Infants, was defined when St.* P. 35. n. 13.

Auguſtine *wrote this, by a full Sentence of a General Council.* You deny *the Con-*
P. 32. n. 2. *ſequence*; for, ſay you, *By Authority of the Church you mean (and not unpro-*
perly) the Church generally practiſing this Doctrine, and defining it in a Natio-
nal Council confirmed by the Pope. For this was plena authoritas Eccleſiæ,
though not pleniſſima; *and to diſpute againſt what was ſo practiſed and defi-*
ned, is, in St. Auguſtine's *ſenſe, to ſhake the Foundation of the Church, if not*
wholly to deſtroy it. It ſeems a little hard to underſtand what you mean
by *the Churches being (not unproperly) ſaid to practiſe this Doctrine:* What,
did the *Church* practiſe the *Doctrine* of the *remiſſion of Original Sin in In-*
fants? That a *Church* ſhould practiſe a Matter of *Faith*, ſeems a little won-
derful; but that it ſhould do this and that *not unproperly*, increaſeth the
admiration. And we might think it a peculiar privilege belonging to
your *Church*, but that ſhe is not ſo much uſed to *practiſe* things more ca-
pable of it. And can you think it enough to run us down, by telling us,
That the Pope, with a National Council, hath defined it, unleſs you firſt
prove, that the *Pope, and a National Council*, have as much Authority as
a *General Council*, which you pretend to be infallible; and if a *National*
Council with the Pope be ſo too, I wonder to what end *General Councils* are
ever call'd, ſince the Infallibility may be had at a much cheaper rate.

And by the ſame reaſon you make *National Councils Infallible*, you may
do *Provincial*, if the *Pope* concurs with them; and, by the ſame reaſon,
the *College* of *Cardinals* may be infallible without any of them, becauſe
of the *Pope's* concurrence with them. And ſo, all this buſineſs of *Councils*,
is but a formal piece of *Pageantry*, ſince all the *Infallibility* they have by
this Pretence, is conferred by the *Pope* in his Concurrence; whoſe Infalli-
bility doth not depend on the preſence of a *Council*; and therefore he muſt
be as Infallible without a *Council*, as with it. So that at laſt this Diſcourſe
comes to this Iſſue, *He that ſhakes the Pope's Infallibility, ſhakes the Founda-*
tion of the Church: and prove but this to have been St. *Auguſtine's* meaning,
you will highly advance the Intereſt of your Cauſe.

§. 5. But, whatever St. *Auſtin's* meaning be, you think your ſelf engaged to
vindicate *Bellarmine, who*, his Lordſhip had ſaid, *was deceived, in ſaying,*
P. 35. n. 13. *That the* Pelagian *Hereſie was never condemned in an Oecumenical Council, but*
only in National. For, ſaith he, *While the* Pelagians *ſtood out impudently a-*
gainſt National Councils, ſome of them defended Neſtorius, *which gave occaſion*
to the firſt Epheſine *Council, to Excommunicate and Depoſe them.* To which
P. 33. n. 3. you anſwer, 1. *It is not credible, that* Bellarmine, *who writ ſo much of Con-*
troverſie, ſhould not have read that Council; nor can there be any ſuſpicion of
his concealing the matter, had he found it there, &c. *and therefore you ſuſpend*
your Aſſent till the Council's words be produced. 2. You tell us, *That it is not*
enough to prove that Pelagianiſm *was condemned by a General Council, becauſe*
ſome who were Pelagians *were*; *but*, ſay you, *They were condemned not for*
Pelagianiſm, *but* Neſtorianiſm, *and therefore his Lordſhip ſhoots wide of the*
Mark. Your Argument from *Bellarmine* will have no great force with
them, who ſee no reaſon to admire his Fidelity; and they who enquire in-
to the Matter of Fact, in the preſent debate, will have cauſe to ſuſpect it.
The ſhort account whereof is this. After that *Julianus, Florus, Orontius,*
Fabius and others, had been depoſed and baniſhed in the *Weſtern Churches*,
for the *Pelagian Hereſie*, they fly to *Conſtantinople*, and ſhroud themſelves
under the Protection of *Neſtorius* the *Patriarch* there, who ſecretly favoured
them, and writ ſeveral Letters to *Pope Celeſtine* in behalf of them; who is
ſuppoſed to have received his Doctrine of the Perſon of *Chriſt* from the *Pela-*
gians. But when he ſaw that no good was to be done by theſe Letters, but

by

by the daily ſpreading of *Neſtorianiſm*, the *Emperor* was forced to ſummon a *Council* at *Epheſus*, *A. D.* 431. The *Pelagians* accompany *Neſtorius* thither, and joyn with *Johannes Antiochenus*, and his Party, in oppoſition to the *Synod*. But the *Council* underſtanding the proceedings which had been in the *Weſtern Churches* againſt the *Pelagians*, ratifies and confirms their Depoſition, as appears by the Synodal Epiſtle of the *Council* to *Pope Celeſtine*, which is extant in the *Acts* of the *Epheſine Council*: And in the Epiſtles of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. And beſides this, ſome of the *Canons* of that *Council*, do equally concern *Celeſtius* and *Neſtorius*; the firſt *Canon* decreeing as well the favourers of *Celeſtius* as *Neſtorius* to be excommunicate; and the fourth decreeing the *Depoſition* of all ſuch who ſhould embrace either of them. And therefore it is truly ſaid by *Janſenius*, that the *Pelagian Hereſie, and the Biſhops who favoured it, were again condemned by an Oecumenical Council.* And thence *Proſper* in the *Epitaph* of the *Neſtorian* and *Pelagian Hereſies*, as he makes the *Neſtorian* only an *Off-ſpring* of the *Pelagian*; ſo he makes both of them to fall, and be condemned together. From whence it appears, that the *Pelagians* were not condemned in the *Epheſine Council* meerly for *Neſtorianiſm*, but for their proper and peculiar Sentiments; the former Depoſition of them being ratified by the *Council*, and a new *Canon* made to that purpoſe for the future. And now let the Reader judge whether his Lordſhip or *Bellarmine* were herein the more miſtaken.

Paulò poſt enim, lectis Commentariis Romæ ſub Cœleſtino conſcriptis, & hæreſis ipſa Pelagiana, & authores, fautoreſque ejus epiſcopi, ab Oecumenica Synodo iterum condemnati ſunt, Janſenius de hæreſ. Pelag. lib. 1. p. 31.

Neſtoriana lues ſucceſſi Pelagianæ,
Quæ tamen eſt utero progenerata meo.
Me tamen una dedit victam ſententia letho:
Illa volens iterum ſurgere, bis cecidit.
Mecum oritur, mecum moritur, mecumq; ſepulchrum
intrat, & inferni carceris ima ſubit.

Proſper in Epitaph. Neſtor. & Pelag. hæreſ.

His Lordſhip adds; *If this Hereſie were condemned only by a National Council, then the full Authority of the Church here, is no more than the full Authority of this Church of* Africk. *And I hope*, ſaith he, *That Authority doth not make all Points defined by it, to be Fundamental. You will ſay, Yes: If that Council be confirmed by the Pope. And then I muſt ever wonder, why St.* Auguſtine *ſhould ſay, The full Authority of the Church; and not beſtow one word upon the Pope, by whoſe Authority only that Council, as all other, have their fulneſs of Authority in your judgment. An inexpiable Omiſſion; if this Doctrine concerning the Pope were true.* To this you anſwer, *That there was no need of any ſpecial mention of the Pope, in ſpeaking of the Authority of the Church; becauſe his Authority is always chiefly ſuppoſed, as being Head of the whole Church.* But by whom was this ſuppoſed? *By you*, or by St. *Auguſtine?* Can you prove that St. *Auſtin*, or any of the *African Fathers* did ever ſuppoſe any ſuch thing, that the *Pope* being Head of the Church, his Authority is chiefly ſuppoſed in the *Acts* of *National Councils?* Where was the ſuppoſal of this Authority in the Diſpute between the *African Fathers*, and the *Popes*, in the caſe of *Appeals?* Theſe are Suppoſitions, only to be obtruded upon ignorant *Novices*; and ſuch, who look no further into *Antiquity*, than the Implicit Faith in their *Prieſts* will give them leave. But what a ſtranger to all true *Antiquity* this Suppoſition of the *Pope's being Head of the Church*, is, we ſhall ſee abundantly, when we come to the Controverſie of the Pope's Authority. Yet granting the Suppoſition true (than which nothing can be more falſe) when the main ſtrength lies not in the bare Definition of a *National Council*, which you grant of it ſelf hath not full *Authority*, but in the confirmation of that Deciſion by the *Pope* which makes that *Authority full*, which was not ſo before; Was it not neceſſary to declare, that the *Pope* did concur to the giving it *full Authority*, which without it could not be had? You do not ſay, That *all National Councils* have this *full*

§. 6. P. 36.

P. 35. n. 4.

Authority, not being confirmed by the *Pope*; if therefore St. *Auguſtine* deſigned to ſhew that *Council* to have *full Authority*, the only way to prove it, was to produce the *Pope's Confirmation* of it: Which cannot therefore be otherwiſe looked on, than as an *inexpiable Omiſſion*, if your Doctrine be true; for he left out that which was only pertinent and material to the Buſineſs. Your Parallel between St. *Auſtin* and *your ſelf* (which is a very worthy one) *in leaving out the mention of the Pope's Authority when it is underſtood*, will then hold when you produce as great evidence that St. *Auſtin* was a *Jeſuit*, as we have from your Principles that you are. When you give us manifeſt proof, that the *Pope's Power* is neceſſary to all *Definitions* of *Councils*, as there is in our *Laws* for our *Kings* aſſenting to *Acts* of *Parliament*; we may give you leave to *parallel the Omiſſion of the expreſs mention of one with the other*. If the Definitions of Ancient *Councils* did run in the name of *Pope* and *Council*, as our *Acts* of *Parliament*, in the name of the *King*, and *both Houſes*, we might eaſily ſay, the Authority of them came from the *Pope*, as of theſe from the *King*; but there is nothing of that nature, but much of the contrary, as will appear in due time. When you therefore prove that the *Pope's* Power is implied, though it be not mentioned, you muſt prove it by ſome evident Confeſſion, that no Authority of a *Council* was *full*, unleſs the *Pope* concurred with it: Elſe you may as well ſay, That the Great *Mogul* hath no full Authority to decree any thing without the *Pope's* conſent; for I dare ſay, There is no denial of it in any of his *Laws*. And yet, that is more than can be ſaid here, for we have ſufficient Teſtimony from the Records of that Age, That the *Pope's Authority* was not ſuppoſed neceſſary to Councils, from his being *Head of the Church*. What follows, *p.* 34. n. 5, 6. depends wholly upon the often-mentioned diſtinction of the *Formal and Material Object* of Faith; the Foundation of which, having been already removed, whatever you offer to build upon it, muſt of neceſſity fall to the ground; but I ſhall not follow your ill Example, *in making tedious Repetitions*, and then cry out, *You are forced to it.*

§. 7. His Lordſhip urgeth further, *from the Romaniſts Doctrine of Fundamentals, That the Churches Definition muſt be the Churches Foundation.* His words are, *Beſides, whatſoever is Fundamental in the Faith, is Fundamental to*
P. 36. n. 14. *the Church, which is one by the Unity of Faith: Therefore, if every thing defined by the Church be Fundamental in the Faith, then the Churches Definition is the Churches Foundation. And ſo, upon the matter, the Church can lay her own Foundation, and then the Church muſt be in abſolute and perfect Being, before*
P. 35. *ſo much as her Foundation is laid.* To which you anſwer; *But what Abſurdity is it to grant, That the Definition of the Church teaching, is the Foundation of the Church taught? Or, the Definition of the Church Repreſentative, is the Foundation of the Church Diffuſive?* I pray, inform us whether this *Church Teaching and Repreſenting*, be the ſame *Church* with the *Church taught and diffuſive*, or one different from it: If it be *different*, it muſt have a different *Foundation*, and ſo muſt be *fundamentally different*; if it be the ſame, then the *Church muſt ſtill lay its own Foundation:* For whatever becomes *Fundamental* by the Definition of the *Church*, is, I ſuppoſe, to be believed as neceſſary, *i. e. Fundamental*, by the *Church Teaching and Repreſenting*, as well as *taught and diffuſive*. Unleſs you think thoſe who decree things, to be believed by all in order to Salvation, do exclude themſelves out of that number; and therefore, though it be neceſſary for all others to believe it, it is ſtill *indifferent* for them, whether they will believe it or no. And therefore, were I of your *Church*, I ſhould heartily wiſh my ſelf of the *Teaching and Repreſentative Church*;

Church; for then others might go to *Hell* for not believing that, which I might chuſe whether I would or no. What an excellent invention this is, to make the *Pope* and *Cardinals* go to *Heaven*, though they be *Atheiſts* and *Infidels?* For, you tell us, we can have no aſſurance of any Matter of Faith, but from the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; this Infallibility lies not in the *taught and diffuſive*, but in the *teaching and repreſentative Church*; and this diſtinction here ſuppoſes, that what is made the *Foundation* of the *Church taught*, is not the Foundation of the *Church teaching*, *i. e.* what is neceſſary to Salvation for one, is not ſo for the other; for that is your meaning of *Fundamentals*. Now, ſince all things become neceſſary to be believed by the *Church diffuſive*, upon the Authority of the *Church repreſentative*; it neceſſarily follows, from this diſtinction, That nothing at all is neceſſary to be believed by the *Church repreſentative*. And is not this a rare Church the mean while? But what is it which makes it a *Church?* for though it *repreſents* and *teaches*, yet it is ſtill call'd a *Church teaching and repreſentative*: If it be a *Church*, ſomething muſt make it ſo: What can make it ſo, if not the belief of what is *neceſſary to Salvation?* And if it doth not believe all that is neceſſary to Salvation, the *Church diffuſive* is much more truly a *Church*, than the *repreſentative*: If it doth believe all that is neceſſary, then it muſt believe its own *Definitions*, becauſe thoſe are ſuppoſed to be ſo; and conſequently, if thoſe be *Fundamental*, *the Church muſt ſtill lay her own Foundation*. Or elſe theſe Conſequences follow. 1. That may be a true *Church*, which doth not believe all things neceſſary to Salvation. 2. The *Church teaching* is not bound to believe that which ſhe *teaches*, but only the *Church taught*. 3. That may be the ſame *Church* which *Fundamentally* differs from it ſelf. 4. When the *Church* defines a thing to be *neceſſary*, ſhe doth not *believe* it to be *neceſſary*, but it becomes neceſſary after her Definition. For, I pray, ſatisfie us as to this *Teaching Church*, when ſhe defines ſomething neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation, which was not ſo defined before; Doth ſhe at that *Inſtant* of her *Definition* believe that to be neceſſary to Salvation, or doth ſhe not? If ſhe doth, then it is neceſſary before her Definition; and ſo the belief of it as neceſſary, cannot depend upon it: But if ſhe believes it only to be neceſſary, becauſe ſhe defines it to be ſo; then ſhe cannot believe it to be neceſſary, till ſhe hath defined it, and conſequently defines that to be neceſſary, which ſhe believes not to be neceſſary: And ſo defines contrary to her own judgment and belief. Let me therefore ask her ſome more Queſtions, which I doubt you will think troubleſome, If the *Church repreſentative* believed that *not to be neceſſary* to Salvation, which ſhe defined *to be neceſſary to Salvation*, was ſhe infallible in that belief or no? If ſhe was not infallible, then at that time what aſſurance could Men have of any Matter of Faith, ſince you tell us, That muſt be had from the *Churches Infallibility?* If ſhe were infallible, then either in *ſome things only*, or in *all* ſhe believed? If only in *ſome things* we ought to know what ſhe is infallible in, and what not, leſt we deceive our ſelves in believing her infallible in that in which ſhe is not infallible? If *in all things*, then ſhe is infallible in believing that *not to be neceſſary* to Salvation, which yet ſhe infallibly defines to *be neceſſary* to Salvation: And ſo the *Church* may infallibly define that to be *true*, which at the very moment of that *Definition*, ſhe infallibly believes to be falſe. All theſe are the juſt and excellent Conſequences of this uſeful Diſtinction of *yours*, which you look on as the only happy Expedient, whereby to free your ſelf from aſſerting, that the *Church*, by making things *Fundamental*, by her *Definitions*, *doth thereby lay her own Foundation*.

But

§. 8. But as abſurd and unreaſonable as this is, you would ſeem to have ſomething to ſay for it: For you tell us, *That the Paſtors, in all Ages preſerving Chriſtian People from being carried away with every Wind of Doctrine, are a Foundation to them of conſtancy in Doctrine.* Wonderfully ſubtle! it is pity ſuch excellent Reaſoning ſhould want the Ornaments of *Mood* and *Figure*: But thus it is in them. If the Paſtors of the Church may be the means of preſerving Men from Errors, then the Definition of the *Church Teaching*, is the Foundation of the *Church taught*: Which in ſhort amounts to this; If the *Paſtors* of the *Church* may be a Foundation of Men's *Conſtancy in Doctrine*, then they may be a Foundation of Men's *Inconſtancy in Doctrine.* If this be not that you mean, I can make no ſenſe of what you ſay; and if it be, let any one elſe make *Senſe* of it, that hath a gift for it. For, by *Conſtancy in Doctrine*, is meant, the adhering to that *Doctrine* which *God hath revealed* as neceſſary in his Word, but by the Definitions of the *Teaching Church*, you underſtand a Power to make more things neceſſary to the Salvation of all than *Chriſt* hath made; ſo that, joyn theſe two together, the Conſequence is this: If the *Paſtors* of the *Church* may, and ought to keep Men from believing any other *Doctrine*, then they have power to impoſe *another Doctrine*; which things are ſo contradictious to each other, that none but one of your *Faculty* would have ventured to have ſet one to prove the other. Therefore when you would prove any thing by this Argument, your *Medium* muſt be this, That the *Paſtors* of the *Church* are a *Foundation of Conſtancy in Doctrine*, by laying *New Foundations of Doctrines* by her Definitions, which is juſt as if you would prove, That the beſt way to keep a Houſe entire, without any Additions, is to build another Houſe adjoyning to it.

Ibid.

But, ſay you further, *Were not the Apoſtles in their times* (*who were* Eccleſia docens) *by their Doctrines and Decrees, a Foundation to the Church which was taught by them? Doth not St.* Paul *expreſly affirm it*, ſuperædificati ſupra Fundamentum Apoſtolorum, *&c.* To which I anſwer, 1. That the *Apoſtles* were not therefore ſaid to be the *Foundation* on which they were built who believed on that Doctrine, becauſe, by virtue of their *Power*, they could define or decree any thing to be neceſſary to Salvation, which was not ſo before; but, becauſe they were the *Inſtruments* whereby the things which were neceſſary to Salvation, were conveyed to them. And becauſe their Authority, by virtue of their *Miſſion*, and the *Power* accompanying it, was the means whereby they were brought to believe the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, as in it ſelf true. But there is a great deal of difference between *teaching* what is neceſſary to Salvation, and making any thing neceſſary to Salvation, which was not before, meerly becauſe it is taught by them. 2. I grant, that thoſe things did become neceſſary to be believed, which the *Apoſtles* taught; but it was either becauſe the things were in themſelves neceſſary, in order to the end declared, *viz. Man's Salvation*, or elſe it was on the account of that evidence which the *Apoſtles* gave, that they were Perſons immediately imployed by *God*, to deliver thoſe Doctrines to them. But ſtill here is nothing becoming neceſſary, by virtue of a Decree or Definition, but by virtue of a *Teſtimony*, that what they delivered, came from *God*. 3. When the *Apoſtles* delivered theſe things, the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel* was not made known to the World; but they were choſen by *God*, and infallibly aſſiſted for that end, that they might reveal it to the World: And this is certainly a very different caſe from that, when the Doctrine of Salvation is fully revealed and delivered down to us in unqueſtionable Records. And therefore, if you will prove any thing to your purpoſe, you muſt prove as great and

and as Divine Aſſiſtance of the Spirit in the *Church repreſentative* of all Ages, as was in the *Apoſtles* in the firſt Age of the Chriſtian Church. 4. When you ſay from hence, That the *Apoſtles*, as the *Teaching Church*, laid the *Foundation of the Church taught*; that can only be underſtood of thoſe *Chriſtians* who became a *Church*, by the *Apoſtles* Preaching the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel* to them: But this is quite a different thing from laying the *Foundation* of a *Church* already in being as your *Church*, taught, and diffuſive, is ſuppoſed to be. Can you tell us, where the Apoſtles are ſaid to lay further Foundations for *Churches* already conſtituted; that they made or declared more things neceſſary to Salvation, than were ſo antecedently to their being a *Church*? But this is your caſe, you pretend a Power in your *Church Repreſentative*, to make more things neceſſary to Salvation, than were before to a *Church* already in *Being*, and therefore ſuppoſed to believe all things neceſſary to Salvation. You ſee therefore, what a vaſt diſparity there is in the caſe, and how far the *Apoſtles* declaring the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, and thereby founding *Churches*, is from being an Argument that the *Repreſentative Church*, may lay the Foundation of the *Church Diffuſive*, which being a *Church* already, muſt have its *Foundation* laid before all new Decrees and Definitions of the *Teaching Church*. So that ſtill it unavoidably follows upon your Principles, That the *Church muſt lay her own Foundation*, and then the *Church* muſt have been in abſolute and perfect *Being*, before ſo much as her *Foundation* is laid. Your weak endeavour of retorting this upon the *Biſhop*, becauſe of the *Apoſtles teaching the Church* of their Age, only ſhews, that you have a good will to ſay ſomething in behalf of ſo bad a cauſe, but that you want ability to do it: As appears by the Anſwers already given, as to the difference of the *Apoſtles* caſe and yours. The ſubſequent *Section*, which is ſpent in a weak Defence of *A. C.'s words*, hath the leſs cauſe to be particularly examined; and beſides, its whole ſtrength lies on things ſufficiently diſcuſſed already, *viz.* the ſufficient Propoſition of Matters of Faith, and the Material and Formal Object of it. P. 39.

§. 9. That which follows pretending to ſomething *New*, and which looks like Argumentation, muſt be more diſtinctly conſidered. *A. C.*'s words are, *That if one may deny, or doubtfully diſpute againſt any one Determination of the Church, then he may againſt another, and another, and ſo againſt all: Since all are made firm to us by one and the ſame Divine Revelation, ſufficiently applied by one and the ſame full Authority of the Church; which being weakned in any one, cannot be firm in any other.* To which his Lordſhip anſwers, 1. *That this is underſtood only of Catholick Maxims, which are properly Fundamental, by* Vincentius Lirinenſis, *from whom this Argument is derived.* 2. *He denies, that all Determinations of the Church are made firm to us by one and the ſame Divine Revelation.* 3. *He denies, that all Determinations of the Church are ſufficiently applied by one and the ſame full Authority of the Church.* Of each of theſe he gives his Reaſons; the examination and defence of which, is all that remains of this Chapter. To the firſt, you anſwer three things (for I muſt digeſt your Anſwers for you.) 1. *That there is no evidence, that* A. C. *borrowed this from* Vincentius, and you give an excellent Reaſon for it, *becauſe good Wits may both hit on the ſame thing*, or at leaſt come near it; which, had it been ſaid of your ſelf, had been more unqueſtionable: But, to let that paſs, 2. You tell us, *That the Doctrine is true, whoſoever ſaid it.* For which, you give this Reaſon. *For the ſame Reaſon which permits not our queſtioning, or denying the prime Maxims of Faith, permits not our queſtioning, or denying any other Doctrine declared by the Church; becauſe it is not the greatneſs or ſmallneſs of the matter, that moves us to give firm Aſſent* P. 38. n. 15. n. 16. P. 37.

sent in Points of Faith; but the Authority of God speaking by the Church. To which I answer, that all this runs upon a Supposition false in it self, which is, *That all our Assurance in Matters of Faith, depends upon the Infallible Authority of the present Church*; which being granted, I would not deny but supposing that *Infallibility* absolute, on the same reason I believe one thing on the *Churches Authority*, I must believe all. For the case were the same then, as to the *Church*, which we say, it is as to the *Scriptures*; he that believes any thing, on the account of its being contained in that *Book* as the *Word of God*, must believe every thing he is convinced to be therein contained, whether the matter be in it self small or great; because the ground of his Belief, is the *Authority of God*, revealing those things to us. And, if therefore you could prove such a *Divine Authority*, constantly resident in the *Church*, for determining all Matters of Faith, I grant your Consequence would hold: But that is too great a *Boon* to be had for *Begging*, and that is all the way you use for it here. If you offer to prove it afterwards, our Answers shall be ready to attend you. But at present, let it suffice to tell you, That we believe no Article of Faith at all upon the *Churches Infallible Authority*; and therefore, though we deny what the *Church* proposeth, it follows not that we are any more liable to question the truth of any Article any further than the *Churches Authority* reaches in it; *i. e.* we deny that any thing becomes an Article meerly upon her *account*. But now, if you remove the Argument from the *present Churches Infallible Authority*, to the *Universal Churches Testimony*, we then tell you, That he who questions a clear, full, universal Tradition of the whole *Church* from *Christ's time* to this, will, by the same reason, doubt of all Matters of *Faith*, which are conveyed by this *Testimony* to us. But then we must further consider, That we are bound by virtue of the *Churches Testimony*, to believe nothing any further, than it appears to have been the constant, full, *Universal Testimony* of the *Church*, from the time of *Christ* and his *Apostles*. Whatever therefore you can make appear to have been received as a necessary Article of Faith in this manner, we embrace it, but nothing else; and on the other side, we say, That whoever doubts, or denies this Testimony, will doubt of all Matters of Faith, because the Ground and Rule of *Faith*, the *Scriptures*, is conveyed to us only through this Universal Tradition.

§. 10. P. 37. n. 8. 3. You answer, *That his Lordship mistakes* Vincentius Lirinensis *his meaning, and falsifies his Testimony thrice at least.* Whereof the *first* is in *rendring* [*de Catholico dogmate*] *of Catholick Maxims*: And here a double most dreadful charge is drawn up against his Lordship; the first from the Accusation of *Priscian*, and the second of no less Authors, than *Rider* and the *English Lexicons*: The first is, for translating the *Singular Number by the Plural*; whereas our most Reverend *Orbilius* himself in the following *Page*, tells us, that this *Catholicum dogma, Vincentius* speaks of, *contains the whole System of the Catholick Faith, and in that System some are Fundamentals, some Superstructures*, (both Plurals) yet all these contained in this one *singular Dogma*: But it was his Lordship's great Mishap not to have his Education in the *Schools* of the *Jesuites*, else he might have escaped the *Lash* for this most unpardonable oversight of rendring *verbum multitudinis* by our Author's own Confession (who makes it larger too than his Lordship doth; for his Lordship saith, it contains only *Fundamentals*, but our Author *Superstructures* too) by the *Plural Number*. But the second fault is worse than this; for, saith our Author

P. 38. very gravely and discreetly with his Rod in his hand, *But in what Author learnt he, that Dogma signifies only Maxims, were it in the Plural Number? Dogma, according to our* English *Lexicons*, Rider, *and others, signifies a Decree, or common*

mon received Opinion, whether in prime, or leſs principal Matters. What a learned Diſpute are we now fallen into? But I ſee you were reſolved to put all but *Boys* and *Pædagogues* out of all likelihood of confuting you; for thoſe are only the Perſons among us, who deal in *Rider* and *Engliſh Lexicons.* I ſee now, there is ſome hopes, that the Orders of the *Inquiſition* may have better *Latin*, than that againſt Mr. *White* had; ſince our old *Jeſuites* begin to be ſo well verſed in ſuch Maſters of the *Latin* tongue. How low is *Infallibility* fallen, that we muſt appeal for knowing what *Dogma fidei* is, to the Definition not of *Popes and Councils*, but of *Rider* and *Engliſh Lexicons?* But it is ill jeſting with our *Orbilius* in ſo ſevere a humour, that his *Grace of Canterbury* cannot ſcape his *Laſh* for not conſulting *Rider's Dictionary* for the ſignification of *Dogma.* But our Author paſſeth, and we muſt attend him, out of his *Grammatical into the Theological School*; and there tells us, *That the Eccleſiaſtical Signification of Dogma, extends it ſelf to all things Eſtabliſhed in the Church, as Matters of Faith, whether Fundamentals or Superſtructures*; *and for this*, Scotus *is cited* (ſomewhat a better Author than *Rider*) *who calls Tranſubſtantiation, Dogma fidei.* I begin to believe now, that *Dogma* is a very large word, and *Fides* much larger, that can hold ſo prodigious a thing as *Tranſubſtantiation* within them. But, notwithſtanding what *Rider* and *Scotus* ſay, none ſo able to explain *Vincentius* his meaning, as *Vincentius* himſelf. To him therefore at laſt our Author appeals and tells us, *That he declares in other places, that he means by Dogma ſuch things as in general belong to Chriſtian Faith without diſtinction.* But doth *Vincentius* any where by *Dogma* mean any ſuch things which were not judged neceſſary by the ancient and Primitive *Church*, but become neceſſary to be believed upon the *Churches Definitions?* Nothing can poſſibly be imagined more directly contrary to the deſign of this whole *Book* than that is, when he appeals ſtill for Matters to be believed to *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent*; and to be ſure, all theſe are required to whatever he means by a *Dogma fidei:* If you therefore can produce any Teſtimonies out of his Book, which can be ſuppoſed in the leaſt to favour the Power of the *Church* in her new *Definitions* of Matters of Faith, you may juſtly challenge to your ſelf the name of an excellent Invention, who can find that in his Book, which all other Perſons find the directly contrary to. Your firſt Citation is out of *ch.* 33. (not 23. as you quote it, or ſome one elſe for you) where he is explaining *what St.* Paul *means by Prophanas vocum novitates. Vocum*, ſaith he, *i. e. Dogmatum, rerum, ſententiarum novitates*; *quæ ſunt vetuſtati, quæ antiquitati contrariæ.* I ſhall not ſcruple to grant you that *Vincentius* by *Dogmata* here, doth mean ſuch things as the *Definitions* of your *Church* are, for he ſpeaks of thoſe things, which all *Chriſtians*, who have a care of their Salvation, are to avoid; of ſuch things as are contrary to all *Antiquity*; and ſuch kind of *Dogmata*, I freely grant the *Definitions* of your *Church* to be. Your ſecond Citation is as happy as the firſt, *cap.* 28. *Creſcat* (ſaith he, ſpeaking of the Church) *ſed in ſuo duntaxat genere, in eodem ſcilicet Dogmate, eodem ſenſu, eâdemque ſententiâ.* An excellent place, no doubt; to prove it in the Churches power to define new Articles of Faith; becauſe the Church muſt always remain in the ſame Belief, *Senſe*, and *Opinion.* When his words but little foregoing are, *Profectus ſit ille fidei non permutatio*, which without the help of *Engliſh Lexicons* you would willingly render by leaving out that troubleſome Particle *non*, that the *beſt progreſs in Faith is by adding new Articles*, though it be as contrary to Reaſon as it is to the ſenſe of *Vincentius Lirinenſis.* If *Vincentius* ſaith, that the *Pelagians erred in Dogmate fidei* (which words nei-

ther appear *cap* 24. nor 34.) he gives this reason for it, because they contradict the *Universal Sense of Antiquity*, and the *Catholick Church*, *cap.* 34. So that still *Vincentius*, where-ever he speaks of this *Dogma fidei*, speaks in direct opposition to your sense of it, for new Definitions of the Church in Matters of Faith. There being scarce any Book extant which doth more designedly overthrow this Opinion of yours, than that of *Vincentius* doth.

§. 11. To shew therefore how much you have wronged his Lordship, and what little advantage comes to your cause by your insisting on *Vincentius* his Testimony: I shall give a brief account both of his Design and Book. The design of it, is, to shew what ways one should use to prevent being deceived, by such who pretend to discover new Matters of Faith, and *Commonit.* 1. c. 1. those he assigns to be these two, settling one's Faith, *on the Authority of Scripture, and the Tradition of the Catholick Church.* But since Men would enquire, *the Canon of Scripture being perfect, and abundantly sufficient for all things, what need can there be of Ecclesiastical Tradition?* He answers, For Cap. 2. finding out the true *Sense* of *Scripture*, which is diversly interpreted, by *Novatianus*, *Photinus*, *Sabellius*, *Donatus*, *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Macedonius*, *Apollinaris*, &c. In the following Chapter, he tells us, what he means by this *Ecclesiastical Tradition*, *Quod ubique*, *quod semper*, *ab omnibus creditum* Cap. 3. *est*, that which hath *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*, joyning in the belief of it. And can any new *Definitions* of the *Church* pretend to all, Cap. 4. or any of these? He after enquires, what is to be done in case a particular *Church* separates it self from the Communion of the *Catholick?* He answers, We ought to prefer the Health of the whole Body, before any pestiferous or corrupted Member. But in case any Novel Contagion should spread over, not a part only, but endanger the *whole Church?* then, saith he, *a Man must adhere to Antiquity*, which cannot be deceived with a pretence of Novelty. But if in *Antiquity*, we find out the Error of two or three particular Persons, or City, or Province; what is then to be done? then, saith he, the *Decrees of General Councils* are to be preferred: But in case there be none? Then he adds, The general consent of the most approved Writers of the *Church* is to be enquired after; and what they all with one consent, openly, frequently, constantly held, writ, and taught, that let every Man look on himself as bound to believe without hesitation. Now then, prove but any one of the new Articles of *Faith* in the *Tridentine Confession* by these Rules of *Vincentius*; and it will appear, that you have produced his Testimony to some purpose: Else nothing will be more strong and forcible against all your Pretences, than this discourse of *Vincentius* is; which he inlarges by the Examples of the *Donatists*, *Arrians*, and others, in the following Chapters; in which still his scope is to assert *Antiquity*, and condemn all *Novelties in Matters of Faith under any Pretext whatsoever.* For this, *Ch.* 12, 14. he cites a multitude of Texts of Scripture; forbidding our following any other Doctrine, but what was delivered by Christ and his *Apostles*; and *Anathematizing* all such as should Preach any *other Gospel:* And concludes that, with this remarkable Speech; *It never was, never is, never will be, lawful to propose any thing* (as Matter of Faith) *to Christian Catholicks, besides what they have received. And it was, is, and will be becoming Christians to Anathematize all such who declare any thing but what they have received.* Do you think this Man was not of your mind in the Doctrine of *Fundamentals?*

Nihil novandum nisi quod traditum est. Nosq; religionem, non quâ vellemus ducere, sed quâ illa duceret, sequi oportere. Idque esse proprium Christianæ modestiæ & gravitatis, non sua posteris tradere, sed à majoribus accepta servare. cap. 9.

Adnunciare ergo aliquid Christianis Catholicis præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nunquam licet, nunquam licebit: & Anathematizare eos qui Adnuncient aliquid, præterquam quod semel acceptum est, nunquam non oportuit, nusquam non oportet, nusquam non oportebit. Vincent. Lerin. cap. 14.

tals? Could he do otherwiſe than believe it in the *Churches Power* to define things neceſſary to Salvation, who would have all thoſe *Anathematized*, who pretend to declare any thing as Matter of Faith, but what they received as ſuch from their *Anceſtors?* And after he hath at large exemplified this in the *Photinian*, *Neſtorian*, *Apollinarian* Hereſies, and ſhewed how little the *Authority* of private *Doctors*, how excellent ſoever, is to be relied on in Matters of Faith; he concludes again with this, *Whatſoever the Catholick Church held univerſally, that, and that alone is to be held by particular Perſons.* And after *admires at the Madneſs, Blindneſs, Pervereneſs of thoſe, who are not contented with the once delivered and ancient Rule of Faith; but are ſtill ſeeking new things, and always are itching to add, alter, take away, ſomething of Religion (or Matter of Faith) as though that were not a Heavenly Doctrine, which may ſuffice to be once revealed; but an Earthly Inſtitution, which cannot be perfect, but by continual Correction and Amendment.* Is not this Man now a fit Perſon to explain the ſenſe of your *Churches* new Definitions, and Declarations in Matters of Faith? And have not you hit very right on this ſenſe of *Dogma*, when here he underſtands by it that *Doctrine of Faith*, which is not capable of any Addition or Alteration? And thus we underſtand ſufficiently what he means by the preſent controverted place; that *if Men reject any part of the Catholick Doctrine, they may as well refuſe another, and another, till at laſt they reject all.* By the *Catholick Doctrine*, or *Catholicum dogma*, there he means the ſame with the *Cœleſte dogma* before, and by both of them underſtands that Doctrine of Faith which was once revealed by *God*, and which is capable of no Addition at all, having *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, *and Conſent*, going along with it; and when you can prove that this *Catholicum Dogma*, doth extend beyond thoſe things which his *Lordſhip* calls *Catholick Maxims*, or properly *Fundamental Truths*, you will have done ſomething to the purpoſe, which as yet you have failed in. And thus we ſay, *Vincentius* his Rule is good, though we do not ſay, that he was *infallible* in the *Application* of it, but that he might mention ſome ſuch things to have had *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent* which had not ſo, ſuch as the buſineſs of not *Re-baptizing Hereticks*, and the Obſervation of *Eaſter*, which you inſtance in. And withall we add, though nothing is to be admitted for Matter of *Faith* which wants thoſe three Marks, yet ſome things may have all three of them, and yet be *no Matters* of *Faith* at all; and therefore not at all pertinent to this queſtion; ſuch as thoſe things are which you inſiſt on, as *depoſita dogmata*; which doubtleſs is a rare way of Probation, *viz.* to ſhew that by *dogmata depoſita*, *Vincentius* means ſome *Articles of Faith* which are not *Fundamental* in the matter of them; and for that make choice of ſuch Inſtances which are no *Matters of Faith at all:* But either ritual Traditions, or Matters of Order, ſuch as the *Form and Matter of Sacraments*, the *Hierarchy of the Church*, *Pædobaptiſm*, *not Re-baptizing Hereticks*, *the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin* Mary. For that of the *Canon of Scripture*, it will be elſewhere conſidered, as likewiſe thoſe other *Church-traditions.*

Quicquid univerſaliter antiquitùs Eccleſ. Catholicam tenuiſſe cognoverit, id ſolùm ſibi tenendum, credendumque decernit. cap. 25. *Mirari ſatis nequeo tantam quorundam hominum veſaniam, tantam excæcatæ mentis impietatem, tantum poſtremò errandi libidinem, ut contenti non ſint traditâ ſemel & acceptâ antiquitùs credendi regulâ; ſed novæ & nova in diem quærunt, ſemperque aliquid geſtiunt religioni addere, mutare, detrahere. Quaſi non cœleſte dogma ſit, quòd ſemel revelatum eſſe ſufficiat; ſed terrena inſtitutio, quæ aliter perfici niſi aſſiduâ emendatione, immò potius reprehenſione, non poſſit.* cap. 26.

Abdicatâ enim qualibet parte Catholici dogmatis, alia quoq; item atq; alia, &c. quid aliud ad extremum ſequetur, niſi ut totum pariter repudietur? cap. 31.

How *the Church ſhould ſtill keep, hoc idem quod antea*, as you confeſs *ſhe ought*, and yet *make ſome things neceſſary to be believed by all, which before her Declaration were not ſo*, is ſomewhat hard to conceive; and yet both §. 12. P. 39.

theſe you aſſert together. Is that which is neceſſary to be believed by all, the ſame with that which was not neceſſary to be ſo believed? If the ſame meaſure of Faith will not ſerve after, which would have done before, is there not an alteration made? *Yes*, you grant, *as to our believing, but not as to the thing, for that is the ſame it was.* But do you in the mean time conſider what kind of *thing* that is which you ſpeak of, which is a thing *propounded to be believed*, and conſidered in no other reſpect, but as it is revealed *by God* in order to our believing it; now when the ſame thing which was required only to be believed implicitly, *i. e.* not at all neceſſarily, is now propounded to be believed expreſly and neceſſarily; the *Fundamental* nature of it, as an *Object of Faith*, is altered. For that which you call *Implicit Faith*, doth really imply as to all thoſe things to be believed implicitly, that there is an indifferency, whether they be believed or no; nothing being neceſſary to be believed, but what is propounded to be expreſly believed: Which being ſo, Can it be imagined there ſhould be a greater alteration in a Matter of Faith, than from its being indifferent whether it were believed or no, to become neceſſary to be expreſly believed by all in order to Salvation? And where there is ſuch an alteration as this in the thing to be believed, who can without the help of a very commodious implicit Faith believe, that ſtill this is *hoc idem quod antea*, the very ſame as a Matter of Faith, which it was before? Though *the Church were careful to preſerve every Iota and Tittle of Sacred Doctrines*; yet I hope it follows not, that every *Iota* and *Tittle* is of as much conſequence, and as neceſſary to be believed, as the main ſubſtance of *Chriſtian Doctrine.* Although *when any Doctrine was violently oppoſed in the Church ſhe might declare her owning it by ſome Overt Act:* Yet thence it doth not follow, that the *Internal Aſſent* to every thing ſo declared is as neceſſary, as to that *Propoſition*, that *Jeſus is the Son of God*, the belief of which the Scripture tells us was the main deſign of the writing of *Scripture.* That *General Councils, rightly proceeding, may be great helps to the Faith of Chriſtians*, I know none that deny; but that by virtue of their Definitions any thing becomes neceſſary to be believed, which was not ſo before, remains yet to be proved.

§. 13. p. 39. You much wonder his Lordſhip ſhould Father that Saying on *Vincentius*, That, *If new Doctrines be added to the old, the Church, which is* Sacrarium veritatis, *the Repoſitory of Verity, may be changed in* Lupanar errorum, *which, his Lordſhip ſaith, he is loth to Engliſh:* For you tell us, *That* Vincentius *is ſo far from entertaining the leaſt thought of it, that he preſently adds*, Deus avertat, *God forbid it ſhould be ſo.* A ſtout Inference! Juſt as if one ſhould ſay, The *Church* of *Rome* may be in time overſpread with the *Mahometan Religion*, but *God* forbid it ſhould be ſo; Were he not an excellent Diſputer, who ſhould hence infer it *impoſſible* ever to be ſo? What you add out of *Vincentius*, only proves, that he did not believe it was ſo in his time, but doth not in the leaſt prove, that he believed it *impoſſible* that ever it ſhould be ſo afterwards; but notwithſtanding all that you ſay, it is evident enough, that *Vincentius* believed it a very ſuppoſable Caſe, by that Queſtion he puts elſewhere. *What if any new contagion doth not only endeavour to defile a part only, but the whole Church? In which*, he ſaith, *we are to adhere to Antiquity.* If you anſwer, he ſpeaks only of *an Endeavour:* It is ſoon replied, That he ſpeaks of *ſuch an Endeavour* as puts Men to diſpute a Queſtion, what they are to do in ſuch a Caſe, and he reſolves at that time, they are not to adhere to the judgment of the *preſent Church*,

Quid ſi novella aliqua contagio non jam portiunculam tantum, ſed totam pariter Eccleſiam commaculare conetur? tunc item providebit, ut antiquitati inhæreat. cap. 4.

Church, but to that of *Antiquity*, which is all we desire in that Case, *viz.* That the *present Church* may so far add to Matters of Faith, that we can in no reason be obliged to rely only upon her judgment. Wherein we are to consider, the *Question* is not of that you call the *diffusive*, but the *representative Church*, all which may be overspread, and yet but a part of the other; but yet if that *Church*, whose judgment you say only is to be relied on may be so infected, it is all one as to those who are to be guided by her *judgment*, whether the *other* be or no. For here *eadem est ratio non entis & non apparentis*, because it is not the Reality, but the Manifestation which is the Ground of Men's relying on the *Churches* judgment. So that if as to all outward *appearance*, and all *Judicial Acts* of the *Church*, she may recede from the ancient Faith, and add *novitia veteribus*, (whether all particular Persons in it do so or no) all ground of relying on the judgment of that *Church*, is thereby taken away. Whether it be *the Church her self, or Hereticks in the Church which make these Additions*, is very little material, if these *Hereticks*, who add these *new Articles of Faith*, may carry themselves so cunningly, as to get themselves the Reputation of the *Catholick Church*: And so that which ought to have been *Sacrarium veritatis*, may become *impiorum & turpium errorum Lupanar*: Which your Church is concerned not to have *Englished*; but by the help of *Rider*, and other good *Authors* of yours, it is no hard matter to come to understand it. And thus we see how much you have abused his Lordship, in charging him with a three-fold Falsification of *Vincentius Lirinensis*.

The second thing which his Lordship answers, is, *That all Determinations of the Church are not made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation; because some are made by Scripture, and others, as* Stapleton *saith, without any evident or probable Testimony of Holy Writ: Though therein* Bellarmine *falls quite off, and confesses in express Terms, that nothing can be certain by certainty of Faith, unless it be contained immediately in the Word of God; or be deduced thence by evident Consequence.* §. 14. P. 39. n. 16. Your only design here, is, to vindicate your two great Champions from contradicting each other, which though it be of little Consequence to the main Assertion of his Lordship, which you knew well enough, and therefore carefully avoid the main Charge of your Enemy, to part two of your quarrelling Friends: Yet since you intend this for a Tryal of your *Skill*, we must see how well you play your *Prize*. Stapleton, *say you, means that we must submit to the Determinations of the Church, and the Traditions she approves, though they be not expressly contained in Scripture.* P. 42. n. 9. Excellently well guessed at *Stapleton*'s meaning! when the very words you cite out of him are, *We ought not to deny our Assent in Matters of Faith, though we have them only by Tradition, or the Decisions of the Church against Hereticks, and not confirmed with evident or probable Testimony of Scripture.* What a rare Interpreter are you grown since your acquaintance with *Rider*, and other *English Lexicons*? Who make *not denying Assent* in Matters of Faith, to be the same with *submitting to the Churches Determinations*, when you know well enough, we plead for Submission to the *Churches Determinations*, where there may be a liberty as to *internal Assent*: And it is as good to make *no evident or probable Testimony of Scripture the same with not being expressly contained in Scripture*; as though nothing which was not expressly contained in *Scripture*, could have any probable Testimony from thence. And from this we may guess what an easie matter it is for you to accommodate all Persons who differ, if one says *Yes*, and the other *No*, you will tell them they do not differ, but that one of them by *Yes*, means *No*, and the other

by

by *No*, means *Yes*. Juſt ſo here you reconcile *Stapleton* and *Bellarmine*; for you ſay, *Stapleton* by [no probable Teſtimony] means ſome kind of probable Teſtimony, *viz.* ſuch as though not expreſs, may be yet deduced from *Scripture*; and *Bellarmine*, when he ſpeaks of *God's written Word*, as the *Ground of Certainty*, means that which is neither *God's Word*, nor yet *written*, viz. *Tradition*. I never met with one who had a better faculty of reconciling than you ſeem to have by this attempt. But his Lordſhip had prevented this Subterfuge as to *Bellarmine* and *Stapleton*, *as if* Stapleton
P. 40. *ſpake of the Word of God Written, and* Bellarmine *of the Word of God unwritten* (as he calls *Tradition*.) For *Bellarmine*, ſaith he, *there treats of the Knowledge which a Man hath of the certainty of his own Salvation. And I hope* A. C. *will not tell us there's any Tradition extant unwritten, by which particular Men may have aſſurance of their ſeveral Salvations. Therefore* Bellarmine's *whole Diſputation there, is quite beſide the matter: Or elſe, he muſt ſpeak of the written Word, and ſo lie croſs to* Stapleton, *as is mention'd*. You
P. 43. tell us, This *Reaſon is very ſtrange*: But I dare ſay, yours exceeds it in ſtrangeneſs, which is, *becauſe* Bellarmine's *deſign was to ſhew, there was no ſuch unwritten Tradition to be found*. But doth *Bellarmine* diſpute againſt any body or no body? If he diſputes againſt any body upon your Principles, thoſe whom he diſputes againſt muſt be ſuch, who aſſert that Men may have certainty of *Faith* concerning their Salvation from *Tradition*; and you would do well to tells us, who thoſe were that pretended that there was a Tradition or unwritten Word delivered down from the *Apoſtles*, that they ſhould be ſaved. And though *Bellarmine* was not to affirm this, yet thoſe he diſputed againſt, upon your Principles muſt be ſuppoſed to do it. But certainly you thought none of your Readers did ever intend to look into *Bellarmine* for the place in Controverſie; for if they did, nothing could be more plain, than that *Bellarmine*'s Reaſon againſt *Catharinus* and others, proceeds wholly and only upon the *written Word*. For, 1. When
Bellarm. de juſtific. l. 3. c. 8. ſect. 2. he ſaith, that *Nothing can be certain with the certainty of Faith, but what is either immediately contained in the Word of God, or may be deduced thence by evident conſequence, becauſe Faith can reſt on nothing, but the Authority of God's Word*; he adds, *That of this Principle, neither the Catholicks nor the Hereticks doubt*. But I pray, do thoſe whom *Bellarmine* there calls *Hereticks*, acknowledge the unwritten Word as a Foundation for the certainty of Faith in the Caſe Diſputed? Therefore it is plain, he ſpeaks excluſively of a written Word. 2. When he mentions the Aſſumption, he evidently explains himſelf of the *written Word*; for, ſaith he, *There is no ſuch Propoſition contained in the Word of God, that ſuch and ſuch a particular Perſon is juſtified; for there are none mentioned therein, ſave* Mary Magdalen, *and a certain Paralytick, of whom it is ſaid, their Sins are forgiven them. Cæteri homines in ſacris literis nè nominantur quidem*. And will *Rider*, and your other good Friends *the* Engliſh *Lexicons*, help you to interpret *Sacræ literæ* by *unwritten Traditions?* Could any one that had either any *common Senſe* left in him, or elſe had not a deſign moſt groſly to impoſe on his Readers, offer to perſwade Men, that *Bellarmine* could here underſtand the *Word of God* in a Senſe common to *Scripture* and *Tradition*. If you can prove that *Bellarmine* ſaith otherwiſe elſewhere, you are ſo far from reconciling *Bellarmine* and *Stapleton*, that you will not eaſily reconcile *Bellarmine* to himſelf.

P. 43, 44. The remainder of this Chapter either refers to ſomething to be handled afterwards, as the *Infallibility of the Church and Councils*, or elſe barely repeats what hath been diſcuſſed already concerning your ſenſe of *Fundamentals*, and there-

therefore I dare not preſume ſo far on the Reader's Patience, as to give him the ſame things *over and over.*

CHAP. IV.

The Proteſtant Doctrine of Fundamentals vindicated.

The unreaſonableneſs of demanding a Catalogue of Fundamentals. The Creed contains the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Communion. The belief of Scripture ſuppoſed by it. The Diſpute concerning the Senſe of Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell, and Mr. Rogers *his Book confeſſed by* T. C. *impertinent: With others of the ſame nature.* T. C.*'s Fraud, in citing his Lordſhip's words. Of Papiſts and Proteſtants Unity. The Moderation of the Church of* England, *compared with that of* Rome. *Her grounds of Faith juſtified. Infant-Baptiſm how far proved out of Scripture alone.*

THis Chapter begins with *a very pertinent Queſtion*, as you call it: We might the eaſier believe it to be ſo, becauſe it is none of your own propoſing; but yet your very calling it, *a pertinent Queſtion*, renders it liable to ſuſpicion, and upon examination, it will be found both unreaſonable and impertinent. The Queſtion was, *What Points the Biſhop would account Fundamental*; and that you may ſhew how neceſſary this Queſtion was, you add; *For if he will have ſome Fundamental, which we are bound to believe under pain of Damnation; and others not Fundamental, which we may, without Sin, queſtion, or deny; it behoves us much to know, what they are. I have ever deſired*, ſay you, *a ſatisfactory Anſwer from Proteſtants to this Queſtion, but could never yet have it in the ſenſe demanded.* An unhappy Man you are, who, it ſeems, have in your time propounded more fooliſh Queſtions, than a great many wiſe Men were ever able to anſwer. But, is it not every jot as reaſonable, That ſince your *Church* pretends to the power of making things neceſſary to the Salvation of all, which were not ſo before, we ſhould have from you an exact *Catalogue* of all *your Churches* Definitions? If for that, you refer us to the *Confeſſion* of Faith, at the end of the *Council of Trent*; ſo may not we, with far greater reaſon, ſend you back to the *Apoſtolical Creed?* There being no Objection which will hold againſt this being a *Catalogue* of our *Fundamentals*, but will hold againſt that *being a Catalogue of yours.* Nay, you aſſert ſuch things your ſelf concerning the neceſſity of believing things defined by the *Church*, as make it impoſſible for you to aſſign the definite number of ſuch things, as are neceſſary for all Perſons, and therefore it is very unreaſonable to demand it of us. For ſtill, when you ſpeak, that the things defined by the *Church*, are neceſſary to the Salvation of all, you add, *Where they are ſufficiently propounded*; ſo that the Meaſure of *Fundamentals* depends on the *ſufficiency* of the *Propoſition.* Now, will you undertake to aſſign what number of things are ſufficiently propounded to the belief of all Perſons? Can you ſet down the exact bounds, as to all Individuals, when their Ignorance is inexcuſable, and when not? Can you tell what the meaſure of their Capacity was? What allowance *God* makes for the Prejudices of Education, where there is a Mind deſirous of Inſtruction? Will you ſay, *God* accounts all thoſe things ſufficiently propoſed to Men's Belief, which you judge to be ſo? Or, that all Men are bound to think thoſe things neceſſary to Salvation, which you

§. 1.

P. 45. n. 1.

you think ſo? By what means ſhall the *Churches* Power of defining Matters of Faith, be ſufficiently propoſed to Men as an Article of Faith? Either by its own Definition, or without? If by it; the thing is propoſed to be believed, which is ſuppoſed to be believed already, before that Propoſition; or elſe the Enquiry returns with as great force, Why ſhould I believe that Definition more than any other? If without it; then the ſufficiency of Propoſition, and the neceſſity of Believing depends not on the *Churches* Definition. Theſe Queſtions I am apt to think *as pertinent* and *neceſſary* as yours was: And, now you know my Senſe, and are ſo diſcontented you could never meet with a ſatisfactory Anſwer from *Proteſtants*, prevent the ſame diſſatisfaction in me, by giving a punctual Anſwer to ſuch neceſſary Queſtions. But, if you think the Demands *unreaſonable*, becauſe they depend on ſuch things, which none can know but *God* himſelf; I pray accept of that as a ſatisfactory Anſwer to your own *very pertinent Queſtion.*

§. 2. But if the Queſtion be propounded not concerning *what things are Fundamental and neceſſary to particular Perſons*, which on the Reaſons formerly given, it is impoſſible to give a *Catalogue* of, but, *of ſuch things which are neceſſary to be owned for Chriſtian Communion*, as I have ſhewed this Queſtion of *Fundamentals* ought only to be taken here; then his Lordſhip's Anſwer was more pertinent than the Queſtion, *viz. That all the Points of the Creed were ſuch: For*, ſaith he, *Since the Fathers make the Creed the Rule of Faith; ſince the agreeing Senſe of Scripture, with thoſe Articles, are the two regular Precepts, by which a Divine is governed about the Faith; ſince your own Council of* Trent *decrees, That it is that Principle of Faith, in which all that profeſs Chriſt, do neceſſarily agree,* & Fundamentum firmum & unicum, *not the firm only, but the only Foundation; ſince it is* Excommunication ipſo jure, *for any Man to contradict the Articles contained in that Creed; ſince the whole Body of Faith is ſo contained in the Creed, as that the ſubſtance of it was believed even before the coming of Chriſt; though not ſo expreſly as ſince, in the number of the Articles: Since* Bellarmine *confeſſes, That all things ſimply neceſſary for all Men's Salvation, are in the Creed and Decalogue, What reaſon can you have to except?* Thus far his Lordſhip. Though from hence it appears, what *little reaſon* you have to except; yet becauſe *of that*, I expect your Exceptions the ſooner: And therefore very fairly paſſing by the Senſe of the *Fathers*, you ask concerning the *Council* of *Trent*; *What if, that call the Creed the only Foundation?* Are you come to a *What if*, with the *Council* of *Trent?* But I ſuppoſe, it is not from *diſputing its Authority*, but *its meaning*; for you would ſeem to underſtand it only *of prime Articles of Faith, and not of ſuch as all are bound upon ſufficient Propoſition expreſly to believe*; for that is all the ſenſe I can make of your words. But, whoever was ſo ſilly, as to ſay, that all ſuch things which are to be believed on *ſufficient Propoſition* that they are revealed by *God*, are contained in the Creed? When you ſeem to imply, That this was the Senſe the Queſtion was propounded in, it is a ſign you little attend to the Conſequence of things: When it is moſt evident, that the *Queſtion* was ſtarted concerning the *Greek Church*, and therefore muſt refer only to ſuch *Fundamentals*, as are neceſſary to be owned in order to the *Being* of a *true Church.* And when you can prove, that any other Articles are neceſſary to that, beſides thoſe contained in the *Creed*, you will do ſomething to purpoſe, but not before. But, you ſuppoſe *them to take the Creed in a very large ſenſe, who would lay up in the folds of it all particular Points of Faith whatever:* And I am ſure, this is not the ſenſe it is to be taken in here, nor that in which his Lordſhip took it. He ſaith indeed, *That if he had ſaid, that thoſe Articles only which are*

P. 42. Sect. 21. n. 1.

P. 44.

expreſſed

expreſſed in the Creed, are Fundamental, it would have been hard to have excluded the Scripture, upon which the Creed it ſelf in every Point is grounded. For nothing is ſuppoſed to ſhut out its own Foundation. And this is built on very good reaſon. For the things contained in the *Creed* are propoſed as matters to be believed; all *Faith* muſt ſuppoſe a *Divine Teſtimony* revealing thoſe things to us, as the *ground* on which we believe them; this *Divine Teſtimony* is never pretended to be contained in the *Creed*; but that it is only a *ſummary Collection* of the moſt neceſſary Points which *God* hath revealed; and therefore ſomething elſe muſt be ſuppoſed as the ground and formal reaſon why we aſſent to the truth of thoſe things therein contained. So that the *Creed* muſt ſuppoſe the *Scripture*, as the main and only Foundation of believing the matters of Faith therein contained. But ſay you, *If all the Scripture be included in the Creed, there appears no great reaſon of ſcruple, why the ſame ſhould not be ſaid of Traditions, and other Points; eſpecially of that for which we admit Scripture it ſelf.* But, do you make no difference between the *Scripture* being ſuppoſed as the *ground* of *Faith*, and all *Scripture* being contained in the *Creed?* And doth not his Lordſhip tell you, *That though ſome Articles may be Fundamental, which are infolded in the Creed, it would not follow, that therefore ſome unwritten Traditions were Fundamental; for, though they may have Authority, and uſe, in the Church, as Apoſtolical, yet are they not Fundamental in the Faith.* And as for that Tradition, *That the Books of Holy Scripture are Divine, and Infallible in every part*; he promiſes to handle it, when he comes to the proper place for it. And there we ſhall readily attend what you have to object to what his Lordſhip ſaith about it. P. 43. n. 2.

But yet you ſay, *His Lordſhip doth not anſwer the Queſtion, as far as it was neceſſary to be anſwered*; we ſay, he doth. *No*, ſay you: *For the Queſtion ariſing concerning the Greek Churches error, whether it were Fundamental or no*; *Mr.* Fiſher *demanded of the Biſhop, What Points he would account Fundamental: to which he anſwers, That all Points contained in the Creed, are ſuch, but yet not only they; and therefore this was no direct Anſwer to the Queſtion; for, though the Greeks error was not againſt the Creed, yet it may be againſt ſome other Fundamental Article not contained in the Creed.* This you call *fine ſhuffling*. To which I anſwer, That when his Lordſhip ſpake of its not being *Fundamentum unicum* in that ſenſe, to exclude all things not contained in the *Creed* from being Fundamental; he ſpake it with an immediate reſpect to the belief of *Scripture*, as an *Infallible Rule* of *Faith*: *For*, ſaith he, *The truth is, I ſaid, and ſay ſtill, That all the Points of the Apoſtles Creed, as they are there expreſſed, are Fundamental. And herein I ſay no more than ſome of your beſt learned have ſaid before me. But, I never ſaid or meant, that they only are Fundamental; that they are* Fundamentum unicum, *is the Council of* Trents, *'tis not mine. Mine is, That the belief of Scripture to be the word of God and Infallible, is an equal, or rather a Preceding Principle of Faith, with, or to, the whole body of the Creed.* Now, what reaſon can you have to call this ſhuffling, unleſs you will rank the Greeks error equal with the denying *the Scripture to be the Word of God?* otherwiſe, his Lordſhips Anſwer is as full and pertinent, as your cavil is vain and trifling. His Lordſhip adds, *That this agrees with one of your own great Maſters*, Albertus Magnus, *who is not far from the Propoſition*, in terminis. To which your Exceptions are ſo pitiful, that I ſhall anſwer them without reciting them; for he that ſuppoſes the ſenſe of Scripture, joyned with the Articles of Faith, to be the Rule of Faith, as *Albertus* doth, muſt certainly ſuppoſe the belief of the Scripture as the §. 3. P. 46. P. 43. n. 2.

Word of God, elſe how is it poſſible its ſenſe ſhould be the Rule of Faith? Again, it is not enough, for you to ſay, That he believed other Articles of Faith, beſides thoſe in the *Creed*, but, that he made them a Rule of Faith together with the ſence of Scripture. 3. All this while here is not one word of Tradition, as the ground on which theſe Articles of Faith were to be believed. If this therefore be your way of anſwering, I know none will contend with you for *fine ſhuffling*. What follows concerning the right ſenſe of the Article of the *Deſcent of Chriſt into Hell*; ſince you ſay, *You* P. 46. n. 4. *will not much trouble your ſelf about it, as being not Fundamental either in his Lordſhips ſenſe, or ours*; I look on that expreſſion as ſufficient to excuſe me from undertaking ſo needleſs a trouble, as the examining the ſeveral ſenſes of it; ſince you acknowledge, *That no one determinate ſenſe is Fundamental*, and therefore not pertinent to our buſineſs. Much leſs is that which follows concerning Mr. *Rogers his Book and Authority*; in which, and that which depends upon it, I ſhall only give you your own words for an Anſwer, *That truly I conceive it of ſmall importance to ſpend much time upon this ſubject*; and ſhall not ſo far contradict my judgment as to do that, which, I think, when it is done, is to very little purpoſe. Of the ſame nature is that of *Catharinus*; for it ſignifies nothing to us, whether you account him an *Heretick* or no, who know, Men are not one jot more or leſs Hereticks, for your accounting them to be ſo or not.

§ 4. You call the *Biſhop*, *your good friend*, *in ſaying*, *That all Proteſtants do* P. 48. n. 6. *agree with the Church of* England *in the main Exceptions, which they joyntly take againſt the* Roman *Church, as appears by their ſeveral Confeſſions. For* (ſay you) *by their agreeing in this, but in little or nothing elſe, they ſufficiently ſhew themſelves enemies to the true Church, which is one, and only one, by Unity of Doctrine*; *from whence they muſt needs be judged to depart, by reaſon of their Diviſions.* As *good a friend* as you ſay his Lordſhip was to you, in that ſaying of his, I am ſure you ill requite him for his *Kindneſs*, by ſo palpable a falſification of his words, and abuſe of his meaning. And all that *Friendſhip* you pretend, lies only in your leaving out that part of the *Sentence*, which takes away all that you build on the reſt. For where doth his *Lordſhip* ſay, That the *Proteſtants only agree in their main Exceptions againſt the* Roman *Church, and not in their Doctrines?* Nay, doth P. 50. n. 1. he not expreſly ſay, *That they agree in the chiefeſt Doctrines, as well as main Exceptions, which they take againſt the Church of* Rome, *as appears by their ſeveral Confeſſions?* But you, very conveniently to your purpoſe, and with a *fraud* ſuitable to your *Cauſe*, leave out the firſt part of *agreement in the chiefeſt Doctrines*, and mention only the latter, leſt your Declamation ſhould be ſpoiled as to your Unity, and our Diſagreements. But we ſee by this, by what means you would perſwade men of both, by Arts and Devices, fit only to deceive ſuch, who look only on the appearance and outſides of things; and yet even there, he that ſees not your growing *Diviſions*, is a great ſtranger to the Chriſtian world. Your great Argument P. 47. n. 4. of the *Unity* of your party, *becauſe, whatever the private Opinions of men are, they are ready to ſubmit their judgments to the cenſure and determination of the Church*; if it be good, will hold as well (or better) for our Unity, as yours, becauſe all men are willing to ſubmit their judgments to *Scripture*, which is agreed on all ſides to be *Infallible*. If you ſay, *That it cannot be known what Scripture determines, but it may be eaſily what the Church defines:* It is eaſily anſwered, that the event ſhews it to be far otherwiſe; for how many Diſputes are there, concerning the *Power* of determining matters of Faith? to whom it belongs, in what way it muſt be managed, whether

whether Parties ought to be heard in Matters of Doctrine, what the meaning of the *Decrees* are, when they are made, which raise as many Divisions as were before them, as appears by the *Decrees* of the *Council* of *Trent*, and the latter of *Pope Innocent* relating to the *five Propositions*: So that upon the whole it appears, setting aside Force and Fraud (which are excellent Principles of *Christian Unity*) we are upon as fair Terms of *Union* as you are among your selves.

You tell us, *That your Church doth Anathematize only such Persons as are obstinate*; but who are they whom she accounts obstinate? Even all who dissent from her in any *Punctilio*. And therefore this is a singular piece of Moderation in your *Church*. *And, you believe the Troubles of* Christendom *rather come from too great freedom taken in Matters of Faith, than from any Severity in the Church of* Rome. The truth is, you have excellent ways of ending Controversies, much like perswading Men to put out their *Eyes*, to end the Disputes about the nature of *Colours*; and if they will not hearken to such prudent Counsel, they are pronounced *Obstinate* and *Perverse*, for offering to keep their *Eyes* in their *Heads*. And if Men will not say, that *White* is *Black*, when your Church bids them do it, these Men are the *troublers of Israel*, and the Fomenters of the *Discords* of the *Christian World*. But if your *Church* had kept to the primitive Simplicity and Moderation, and not offered to define Matters of Faith; the occasion of most of the Controversies of the *Christian World* had been taken away. Believe what you will, and speak what you list; there are none who consider what they believe or speak, but easily discover whence the great Dissentions of the Christian World have risen, *viz.* from the *Ambition* and *Usurpation* of the *Church* of *Rome*, which hath not been contented to have introduced many silly Superstitions into the publick Exercise of Devotion; but, when any of these came to be discovered, thought it her best course to defend her Corruptions with greater; by inforcing Men to the *belief* of them, and thereby rendring a *Separation* from her Communion unavoidable by all those who sought to retrieve the Piety and Devotion of the Primitive *Church*. And yet this must be call'd *Schism*, and Persons attempting it *Hereticks*, by that same *Pious and Tender-hearted Mother of yours*, who loves her *Children* so dearly, that if they do but desire any Reformation of Abuses, she takes all possible care they shall complain no more. As though the only way to prevent quarelling in the World, were to cut out Peoples *Tongues*, and cut off their *Arms*; such a kind of *Unity* hath your *Church* shewed her self very desirous of, where-ever Power and Conveniency have met for the carrying it on. But, I hope, you will give us leave, not to envy the *Unity* of those, who therefore agree in the *Church*, because, as soon as they do in the least differ from it, they are pronounced not to be of it, for opposing the Determinations of it. And yet, notwithstanding, the Violence and Fraud used in your *Church* to preserve its *Unity*, the World is alarm'd with the noise of its Dissentions, and the increase of the differing Parties, who manage their Contests with great Heats and Animosities against each other, under all the great Pretences of your *Unity*. I cannot but therefore judge it a very prudent Expression of his Lordship, *That as the Church of* England *is not such a Shrew to her Children, as to deny her Blessing, or denounce an* Anathema *against them, if some peaceably dissent in some particulars remoter from the Foundation: So, if the Church of* Rome, *since she grew to her Greatness, had not been so fierce in this course, and too particular in determining too many things, and making them Matters of necessary Belief, which had gone for many hundred of Years before, only for things of pious Opinion*;

§. 5. P. 48. n. 6.

P. 50. n. 1.

nion; Chriſtendom *(I perſwade my ſelf) had been in happier Peace at this*
P. 49. *day, than, I doubt, we ſhall ever live to ſee it.* And it is an excellent Reaſon you give, why the *Church* of *Rome* doth impoſe her Doctrine on the whole World, under pain of Damnation; *becauſe it is not in her power to do otherwiſe.* There is little hopes then of amendment in her, if ſhe thinks ſo. But, you tell us, *Chriſt hath commanded her to do it.* What hath he commanded her to do? To add to his Doctrine by making things neceſſary, which he never made to be ſo? Is it in that place, where he bids the *Apoſtles, to teach all that he commanded them*, that he gives power to the Church, *to teach more than he commanded?* But this is a new kind of *Supererogation*, to make more Articles of Faith, than ever Men were required to make. Where ſtill is this *Command* extant in *Scripture?* Not ſure any where, but in that moſt appoſite place produced to that, and all other good purpoſes which have nothing elſe to prove them; even *Dic Eccleſiæ, If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and a Publican*; therefore the *Church* of *Rome* is commanded by *Chriſt*, to impoſe her Doctrine on the whole *Church*, upon pain of Damnation. Sure you will pronounce Men *obſtinate*, that dare in the leaſt queſtion this, after ſo irrefragable a demonſtration of it. And you may well cry, *Scripture* is not fit to decide Controverſies, when you conſider the lame *Conſequences*, you, aboveall Men, derive from it.

§. 6. His Lordſhip ſhews the Moderation of the *Church* of *England*, even in
P. 51. n. 2. that *Canon* which *A. C.* looks on as the moſt ſevere, where ſhe pronounces Excommunication on ſuch as affirm, that the Articles are in any part Superſtitious or Erroneous, *&c.* by theſe things. 1. *That it is not meant of Men's private judgments, but of what they boldly and publickly affirm.* 2. *That it is one thing to hold contrary to ſome part of an Article; and another, poſitively to affirm, That the Articles in any part are Superſtitious or Erroneous.* 3. *The Church of* England *doth this only for thirty nine Articles; but the Church of* Rome *doth it, for above a hundred in matter of Doctrine.* 4. *The Church of* England *never declared, That every one of her Articles are Fundamental in the Faith; but the Church of* Rome *requires, that all be believed as Fundamental, when once the Church hath determined them.* 5. *The Church of* England *preſcribes only to her own Children, and by thoſe Articles provides but for her own peaceable conſent in thoſe Doctrines of Truth. But the Church of* Rome *ſeverely impoſes her Doctrine upon the whole World, under pain of Damnation.* To all theſe very conſiderable Inſtances of our *Churches* Moderation, your Anſwer is, *The Queſtion is not, Whether the* Engliſh *Congregati-*
P. 49. n. 3. *on, or the* Roman *Church be more ſevere; but, Whether the* Engliſh *Proteſtants Severity be not unreaſonable; ſuppoſing ſhe be ſubject to Error in defining thoſe Articles.* For after many other words to the ſame, *i. e.* little purpoſe, the Reaſon you give for it, is, *That every unjuſt Excommunication inflicted for oppoſing of Doctrine, muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe the Doctrine oppoſed to be infallibly true, and abſolutely exempt from Error; otherwiſe the Sentence it ſelf would be unreaſonable and unjuſt, as wanting ſufficient ground.* From whence you charge Proteſtants with greater *Tyranny* and *Injuſtice* towards their People, than they can with any colour or pretence of Reaſon, charge upon the *Roman Church*, which Excommunicates no Man, but for denying ſuch Doctrine *as is both infallibly true, and alſo Fundamental, at leaſt as to its formal Object.* This is the ſtrength of all you ſay, which will be reduced to this ſhort Queſtion, Whether the proceedings of that *Church* be more unreaſonable, which excommunicates ſuch as openly oppoſe her Doctrine, ſuppoſing her *Fallible*; or of that *Church*, which excommunicates all who

will

will not believe whatever ſhe defines to be *Infallibly true*. This is the true State of the *Controverſie*, which muſt be judged by the reſolving another Queſtion, Whether it be not a more unreaſonable *Uſurpation*, to bind Men upon pain of *Damnation* hereafter, and Excommunication here, to believe every thing *Infallible* which a *Church* defines, or to bind Men to Peace to a *Churches Determinations*, reſerving to Men the liberty of their judgments, on pain of Excommunication, if they violate that Peace. For it is plain on the one ſide, where a *Church pretends Infallibility*, the Excommunication is directed againſt the Perſons for refuſing to give *Internal Aſſent* to what ſhe defines: But, where a *Church* doth not pretend to that, the Excommunication reſpects wholly that *Overt Act*, whereby the *Churches Peace* is broken. And if a *Church* be bound to look to her own Peace, no doubt ſhe hath power to *Excommunicate* ſuch as openly violate the Bonds of it; which is only an Act of Caution in a *Church*, to preſerve her ſelf in *Unity*; but where it is given out, that the *Church is Infallible*, the Excommunication muſt be ſo much the more unreaſonable, becauſe it is againſt thoſe *Internal Acts* of the Mind, over which the *Church*, as ſuch, hath no direct Power. And thus, I hope, you ſee how much more juſt and reaſonable the Proceedings of our *Church* are than of yours; and that, *eo nomine*, becauſe ſhe pretends to be infallible, and ours doth not.

His Lordſhip ſhews further in *Vindication* of the *Church of* England, *and her grounds of Faith, that the Church of* England *grounded her Poſitive Articles upon Scripture; and her Negative do refute there, where the thing affirmed by them, is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And this* (he ſaith) *is the main Principle of all Proteſtants, that Scripture is ſufficient to Salvation, and contains in it all things neceſſary to it. The Fathers are plain, the Schoolmen not ſtrangers in it. And* Stapleton *himſelf confeſſes as much.* Nay, and you dare not deny it, as to all material Objects of Faith, and your formal here ſignifies nothing. And when *A. C.* ſaith, *That the Church of* England *grounded her Poſitive Articles upon Scripture, if themſelves may be Judges in their own cauſe.* His Lordſhip anſwers, *We are contented to be judged by the joynt and conſtant belief of the Fathers, which lived within the firſt four or five hundred Years after Chriſt, when the Church was at the beſt, and by the Councils held within thoſe times, and to ſubmit to them in all thoſe Points of Doctrine. This Offer* you grant to be *very fair*, and you do, *for your ſelves, promiſe the ſame, and ſay, You will make it good upon all Occaſions.* Which we ſhall have tryal of before the end of this Book. To what his Lordſhip ſaith, concerning *the Negative Articles, That they refute where the thing affirmed by them is either not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly to be concluded out of it. A. C.* replies, *That the Baptiſm of Infants is not expreſly (at leaſt not evidently) affirmed in Scripture, nor directly (at leaſt not demonſtratively) concluded out of it.* Here two things his Lordſhip anſwers. 1. *To the Expreſſion.* 2. *To the Thing.*

§. 7. P. 52. Sect. 15. n. 1.

P. 53. n. 2.

P. 51.

1. *To the Expreſſion*; *That he is no way ſatisfied with* A. C. *his Addition, (not expreſly, at leaſt not evidently:) for* (ſaith he) *What means he? If he ſpeak of the Letter of Scripture, then whatſoever is expreſly, is evidently in the Scripture, and ſo his Addition is in vain. If he ſpeak of the meaning of Scripture, then his Addition is cunning. For many things are expreſly in Scripture, which yet in their meaning are not evidently there.* And as little ſatisfied his Lordſhip declares himſelf, with that other *(not directly, at leaſt not demonſtratively) becauſe many things are directly concluded, which are not damonſtratively.* To the firſt you anſwer, *That a Point may be expreſt, yet not evidently expreſt; otherwiſe there could be no doubt concerning what*

P. 54. n. 1.

P. 51. n. 9.

what were expreſt in Scripture, ſince Men never queſtion things that are evident. Now, ſay you, *the Baptiſm of Infants muſt not only be expreſt, but evidently expreſt, to prove it ſufficiently,* i. e. *undeniably, by Scripture alone.* But the Queſtion being concerning *Matters of Doctrine*, and not *meer words*, thoſe things are *expreſly* affirmed, which are *evidently*, and no other: For it is one thing for *words* to be *expreſly* in Scripture, and another for *Doctrines* to be ſo. For theſe latter are no further *expreſly* affirmed there, than as there is *evidence*, that the meaning of ſuch words doth contain ſuch a *Doctrine* in them. As to take your own Inſtance, *This is my Body*, we grant the words to be *expreſs*; but we deny, that which he had then in his hands was his *real Body*; (for his Hands were part of his real Body.) Now, we do not ſay, That the *Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation* is *expreſly*, but not *evidently* contained here; for, we ſay, The *Doctrine* is not there at all, but only that thoſe are the *expreſs words*; *This is my Body*; as it is in other figurative Expreſſions in *Scripture.* But that which cauſeth this litigation about words, is, That you look upon that which is *evident* and *undeniable* to be all one, whereas there may be *ſufficient evidence*, where all Men are not perſwaded by it. And ſo you would put his Lordſhip to prove out of *Scripture*, *Infant-Baptiſm evidently and demonſtratively*, i. e. *undeniably*; whereas his Lordſhip ſuppoſeth it enough for his purpoſe, to prove it by ſuch ſufficient Evidence, as may convince any reaſonable Man. And this was all his Lordſhip meant, when he ſaid, *That our Negative Articles do refute, where the thing is not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly concluded out of it.* And, if you will ſtand to the ſtrict ſenſe of theſe words, you will be forced to prove all thoſe Doctrines of your *Church*, which ours denies to be true, ſo *evidently and demonſtratively*, i. e. *undeniably*, as you would put him upon for the proof of *Infant-Baptiſm.*

§. 8. To leave therefore this Verbal Diſpute, and come to the *thing:* His
P. 55. n. 4. Lordſhip ſaith, *That it may be concluded directly out of Scripture, That Infants ought to be Baptized, &c.* For which, he inſiſts *on two places of Scripture*, John 3. 8. *Except a Man be born again of Water, and of the Spirit*, &c. *which being interpreted according to the ſenſe of the Fathers, and the ancient Church, and as your own Party acknowledge it ought to be interpreted, do evi-*
P. 52. n. 1. *dently aſſert Infant-Baptiſm.* By which, *your Exception of a Pelagian Anabaptiſt, who denies Original Sin, and from thence ſaith, That Infants cannot be born again, is taken away*; for the ſame *Tradition* of the *Ancient Church*, which from hence infers the *Baptiſm of Infants*, doth it upon that ground, *becauſe they are guilty of Original Sin*, as you might have ſeen by his *Lordſhip's Citations* to that purpoſe. The other place he inſiſts on, is,
P. 56. *Act.* 2. 38, 39. which, by the acknowledgement of *Ferus* and *Salmeron*, holds for *Infant-Baptiſm.* But, when you ſay, *That you would not weaken the Argument from* John 3. *for Infant-Baptiſm; becauſe you only would ſhew, that it cannot be proved demonſtratively from Scripture alone, againſt a perverſe Heretick:* You ſeem not much to conſider what thoſe *perverſe Hereticks* (as you call them) hold as to *Infant-Baptiſm*, which is, not meerly that *Infant-Baptiſm* is not commanded in *Scripture*, but that it is a thing *unlawful*, as being a perverting of the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, as to the ſubject of *Baptiſm.* For the main Queſtion between us and the *Antipædobaptiſts*, is not, concerning an abſolute and expreſs *Command* for *Baptizing Infants*; but whether our *Bleſſed Saviour* hath not by a poſitive *Precept* ſo determined the Subject of Baptiſm, *viz. adult Perſons* profeſſing the Faith, that the alteration of the Subject, *viz. in Baptizing Infants*, be not a deviation from, and perverſion of the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* in a *ſubſtantial part* of it; or

in

in ſhort thus, whether our *Saviour* hath ſo determined the ſubject of Baptiſm, as to exclude *Infants*. And although, the queſtion being thus ſtated, the proof ought to lie on thoſe who affirm it, yet taking in only the help of *Scripture* and reaſon, it were no difficult matter to prove directly and evidently, that *Infants* are ſo far from being excluded *Baptiſm* by the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, that there are as many grounds as are neceſſary to a matter of that nature, to prove that the Baptizing them is ſuitable to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and agreeable to the *ſtate* of the *Church* under the *Goſpel*. For, If there were any ground to exclude them, it muſt be either the *incapacity* of the *ſubject*, or ſome expreſs precept and *Inſtitution* of *our Saviour*. But neither of theſe can be ſuppoſed to do it.

1. Not incapacity as to the ends of *Baptiſm*: for clearing which, theſe two things muſt be premiſed: 1. *That the rule and meaſure, as to the uſe and capacity of Divine Inſtitutions, is to be fetched from the end of them.* For, this was the ground of the Circumciſion of the *Proſelytes* under the *Law*: and this was the way the *Apoſtles* did interpret *Chriſt's Commiſſion* for Baptizing all Nations, as to the capacity of the ſubjects of it, Act. 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be Baptized, which have received the Holy Ghoſt, as well as we:* where the queſtion was concerning the *ſubject of Baptiſm*. For it might be made evident, that the *Apoſtles* at firſt did interpret their Commiſſion of *Baptizing all Nations*, only of the *Jews of all Nations*: for after that, S. *Peter* looked on the *Gentiles as unclean*: and the Diſciples at *Jeruſalem* charged S. *Peter* with it, as a great fault, *for going in to men uncircumciſed*, Acts 11. 3. Therefore we ſee when the queſtion was concerning the *ſubject of Baptiſm*; the only Argument is drawn from the *deſign* and *ends* of it; that they who were capable of the thing ſignified ought not to be denied the uſe of the ſign. And thus by a parity of reaſon built on equal grounds, thoſe who are capable of the great things repreſented in *Baptiſm* and confirmed by it, *viz. God's pardoning grace, and acceptation to eternal life*, ought not to be denied the external ſign, which is Baptiſm it ſelf. And therefore, 2. *Where there is a capacity as to the main ends of an Inſtitution, an incapacity as to ſome ends doth not exclude from it.* As is moſt evident in the Baptiſm of our *Bleſſed Saviour*, in whom there was a greater incapacity as to the main ends of Baptiſm, than poſſibly can be in *Infants*; for his *Baptiſm* could not at all be *for the remiſſion of ſins*. Now we ſee, although there were but one end, and that a very general one mentioned, *That he might fulfil all righteouſneſs*, Matth. 3. 15. yet we ſee, that was ſufficient to perſwade *John* to Baptize him. Whereby we ſee evidently in this practice of our *Saviour* built on a general and common ground, that a capacity as to one end of a poſitive *Inſtitution*, is ſufficient to make ſuch a practice lawful, and in ſome caſes a duty. § 9.

Theſe two general *Principles* being laid down; it were eaſie to ſhew, 1. That what incapacity there is in *Infants*, is not deſtructive of the main ends of Baptiſm; which is chiefly thought to be the incapacity of underſtanding the nature or ends of the *Inſtitution*; and if that exclude, it muſt either be, that it is a thing repugnant to reaſon, that any Divine *Inſtitution* ſhould be applied to perſons uncapable of underſtanding the nature and ends of it, which would highly reflect on the wiſdom of *God* in appointing Circumciſion for Children eight days old, who were certainly as uncapable of underſtanding the ends of that, as our *Children* are of Baptiſm; or elſe, that there is ſome peculiarity in the *Inſtitution* of Baptiſm, which muſt exclude them from it under the Goſpel: which that there is not, will appear preſently.

2. That

2. That *there is a capacity in Infants as to the main ends of Baptiſm*, which have either an aſpect from *God* to us, in regard of its *Inſtitution*, or from us to *God*, in regard of our *undertaking* it. Now the chief ends of a Divine Inſtitution as ſuch, are *ſuch* as reſpect *Gods* Intention in it towards us, in which reſpect it is properly a *ſign*; but as it reſpects *God* from us, it is properly a *Ceremony* betokening our profeſſion and reſtipulation towards *God*. Now the ends of it as a *ſign*, are to repreſent and exhibit to us the nature of the *grace* of the *Goſpel* as it cleanſeth and purifieth, and to confirm the truth of the *Covenant* on *God's part*, and to enſtate the partakers of it in the privileges of the *Church* of *God*; now as to all theſe ends, there is no incapacity in *Infants* to exclude them from Baptiſm, becauſe of them. So that nothing can ſeem wanting of the *ends* of Baptiſm, but that which ſeems moſt *Ceremonial* in it, which is the perſonal *reſtipulation*, which yet may reaſonably be ſupplied by *Sponſors*, ſo far as to make it of the nature of a ſolemn *Contract* and *Covenant* in ſight of the Congregation. Thus far it appears from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, that no incapacity in *Infants* doth exclude them from Baptiſm.

2. That there is no direct or conſequential prohibition made by our *Bleſſed Saviour* to exclude them. For granting that he had the power to limit and determine the ſubject of *Baptiſm*, the queſtion is, Whether he hath ſo far done it as to exclude *Infants?* And nothing of that nature is pretended, before the laſt Commiſſion given to the *Apoſtles, of Teaching and Baptizing all Nations*, Matth. 28. 19. And that by this expreſſion there is no excluſion of *Infants* will appear; 1. If our *Saviour* had intended the gathering of *Churches* among the *Gentiles* according to the *Law of Moſes*, he could hardly have expreſſed it after another manner than thus, *Go Proſelyte all Nations, Circumciſing them.* Now I appeal to any mans judgment and reaſon, whether in ſuch words it could be imagined, that the *Infants* of ſuch *Gentile-Proſelytes* ſhould be excluded Circumciſion; and what reaſon can there be then from theſe words to imagine, that our *Saviour* did intend to exclude the Infants of *Gentile-Converts* from Baptiſm? 2. We muſt conſider, what apprehenſions thoſe whom our *Saviour* directed theſe words to, *viz.* the Apoſtles, had concerning the *Church-ſtate* of ſuch as were in an external Covenant with God, which they meaſured by the general reaſon of that *Covenant* which *God* made with the *Jews*; Can we then think, that when our *Saviour* bid the *Apoſtles* gather whole Nations into *Churches*, they ſhould imagine the *Infants* were excluded out of it, when they were ſo ſolemnly admitted into it, in that diſpenſation which was in uſe among them? 3. The *Gentiles* being now to be firſt *Proſelyted* to *Chriſtianity*, the order of the words was neceſſary: for who ever imagined, but that ſuch as were wholly ſtrangers to *Chriſtianity*, as thoſe were whom *Chriſt* there ſpeaks of, were to be *firſt taught*, or diſcipled, before they were to be Baptized? For ſuppoſe, it ſhould be ſaid to ſuch perſons among whom *Infant Baptiſm* is the moſt uſed, *Go and Diſciple the Indians, Baptizing them*, &c. could any one conceive the intention of ſuch a Commiſſion was to exclude the *Infants* of all thoſe *Indians* from *Baptiſm*, when it was well known that *Infant-Baptiſm* was uſed among thoſe who came with that Commiſſion? And therefore neither theſe words here, nor thoſe Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is Baptized*, &c. can in reaſon be ſo interpreted as to exclude *Infants*, when the meer order of nature, and neceſſity of the thing, requires that thoſe who firſt own *Chriſtianity* by being Baptized, ought, before ſuch *Baptiſm*, not only to believe, but to make profeſſion of that Faith; but this reacheth not at all to the caſe of ſuch *Infants*

fants as are born of thoſe perſons. For if any one had ſaid to *Abraham*, *He that believes, and is circumciſed, ſhall be ſaved*, Could it have been ſo interpreted, that the intention was to exclude his *Children* from *Circumciſion?* No more ought theſe words of our *Saviour* be ſtrained to a greater prejudice of the right of *Infants* to Baptiſm, than thoſe other to their right of Circumciſion. And thus far we ſee there is no ground from *Scriptures*, or *Reaſon*, why Infants ſhould be excluded.

§. 18. And, were it not too large a Digreſſion, I might further ſhew how ſuitable the Baptiſm of *Infants* is to the adminiſtration of *things* under the *Goſpel*; but I ſhall only propound ſome conſiderations concerning it. 1. That if it had been *Chriſts intention* to exclude *Infants*, there had been far greater reaſon for an expreſs prohibition; than of an expreſs command, if his intention were to admit them: becauſe this was ſuitable to the general grounds of *Gods diſpenſation* among them before. 2. It is very hard to conceive that the *Apoſtles* thought Infants excluded by *Chriſt*, when after *Chriſt's Aſſention* they looked on themſelves as bound to obſerve the *Jewiſh Cuſtoms*, even when they had Baptized many thouſand People. 3. If admiſſion of *Infants* to Baptiſm were a meer Relique of Judaiſm, it ſeems ſtrange that none of the *Judaizing Chriſtians* ſhould be charged with it, who yet are charged with the obſervation of other *Judaical* rites. 4. Since the *Jewiſh Chriſtians* were ſo much offended at the neglect of Circumciſion, *Acts* 21. 21. Can we in reaſon think they ſhould quietly bear their *Childrens* being wholly thrown out of the *Church*; as they would have been, if neither admitted to Circumciſion nor Baptiſm? 5. Had it been contrary to *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, we ſhould not have had ſuch evidence of its early practice in the *Church* as we have. And here I acknowledge the uſe of *Apoſtolical Tradition* to manifeſt this to us; In which ſence I acknowledge what St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *That the cuſtom of our mother the Church is not to be contemned or thought ſuperfluous, neither is it to be believed but as an Apoſtolical Tradition.* For that the words are to be read ſo, (and not, as you tranſlate them, *nor at all to be believed unleſs it had been an Apoſtolical Tradition*, from thence inferring, that *Infant-Baptiſm were not to be believed at all, but for Tradition*) appears by three *ancient Manuſcripts at Oxford*, as well as the courſe of the ſentence, and St. *Auſtin's* judgment in other places, *viz.* that it ought to be read, *Nec omninò credenda niſi Apoſtolica traditio eſſe*, and not *eſſet.* But we grant that the practice of the *Church* from *Apoſtolical times* is a great confirmation that it was never *Chriſt's intention* to have *Infants* excluded from *Baptiſm.* And thus much may ſuffice to ſhew, what evidence we have from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, without recourſe wholly to *Tradition*, or building upon any more controverted *places*, to juſtifie the *Churches practice in Infant-Baptiſm*, which is as much as is neceſſary for us to do. What follows concerning the founding *Divine Faith on Apoſtolical Tradition*, will be fully conſidered in the ſucceeding *Controverſie* concerning the *reſolution of Faith*, to which we now haſten.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Romaniſts way of Reſolving Faith.

The ill conſequences of the reſolution of Faith by the Churches Infallibility. The grand Abſurdities of it. manifeſted by its great unreaſonablneſs in many particulars. The certain Foundations of Faith unſettled by it, as is largely proved. The Circle unavoidable by their new attempt. The impoſſibility of proving the Church Infallible by the way that Moſes, *Chriſt, and his Apoſtles were proved to be ſo. Of the Motives of Credibility, and how far they belong to the Church. The difference between Science and Faith conſider'd, and the new art of Mens believing with their wills. The Churches teſtimony muſt be, according to their principles, the formal object of Faith. Of their eſteem of Fathers, Scripture and Councils. The rare diſtinctions concerning the Churches infallibility diſcuſſed. How the Church can be Infallible by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, yet not divinely Infallible, but in a manner and after a ſort.* T. C. *applauded for his excellent faculty in contradicting himſelf.*

§. 1. HE that hath a mind to betray an *excellent Cauſe*, may more advantageouſly do it, by bringing weak and inſufficient Evidences for it, than by the greateſt heat and vigour of Oppoſition againſt it. For there cannot poſſibly be any greater *prejudice* done to a weighty and important truth, than to perſwade Men to believe it on ſuch *grounds*, which are, if not abſolutely falſe, yet much more diſputable than the thing it ſelf. For hereby the minds of Men are taken off from the native evidence, which the *truth* enquired after offers to them, and build their aſſent upon the certainty of the *mediums* ſuggeſted as the only grounds to eſtabliſh a firm aſſent upon. By which means, when upon ſevere enquiry, the falſity and inſufficiency of thoſe grounds is diſcovered, the perſon ſo diſcovering lies under a dangerous temptation of calling into *queſtion* the truth of that, which he finds he aſſented to upon *grounds* apparently weak and inſufficient. And the more refined and ſubtle the *ſpeculations* are, the more ſublime and myſterious the matters believed; the greater ſtill the danger of *Scepticiſm* is, upon a diſcovery of the unſoundneſs of thoſe principles which ſuch things were believed upon. Eſpecially, if the more confident and Magiſterial party of thoſe who profeſs the belief of ſuch things, do with the greateſt heat decry all other ways as uncertain, and obtrude theſe principles upon the world, as the only ſure *foundation* for the belief of them. It was anciently a great queſtion among the *Philoſophers*, whether there were any certainty in the principles of knowledge; or, ſuppoſing certainty in things, whether there were any undoubted κριτήρια, or *rules* to obtain this certainty of knowledge by: If then any one *Sect* of *Philoſophers* ſhould have undertaken to prove the *certainty* that was in *knowledge* upon this account, becauſe *whatever their Sect or Party delivered was infallibly true*; they had not only ſhamefully beg'd the thing in diſpute, but made it much more liable to queſtion than before. Becauſe every *error* diſcovered in that *Sect*, would not only prove the fondneſs and arrogance of their pretence of being *Infallible*; but would, to all ſuch as believed the certainty of things on the *authority* of their *Sect*, be an argument to diſprove all certainty of knowledge, when they once diſcovered the *errors* of thoſe whoſe authority they relied upon. Juſt ſuch is the caſe of the

Church

Church of *Rome* in this present Controversie concerning the *Resolution of Faith.* The question is, *What the certain Grounds of our Assent are to the Principles and Rule of Christian Religion?* The *Romanists* pretend, that there can be no ground of *True* and *Divine Faith* at all, but the Infallible Testimony of their *Church*; let then any rational Man judge, whether this be not the most compendious way to overthrow the Belief of *Christianity* in the World? For our assent must be wholly suspended upon that supposed *Infallibility*, which when once it falls (as it unavoidably doth upon the discovery of the least Error in the Doctrine of that *Church*) what becomes then of the Belief of Christianity which was built upon that, as its only sure Foundation? So that it is hardly imaginable, there could be any design more really destructive to *Christianity*, or that hath a greater tendency to *Atheism*, than the modern pretence of *Infallibility*, and the *Jesuits way of resolving Faith.*

Which was the reason why his *Lordship* was *so unwilling to engage in that Controversie, How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God:* Not out of any distrust he had of solving it upon *Protestant Principles*, as you vainly suggest; nor out of any fears of being left himself in that *Labyrinth*, which, after all your Endeavours you have lost *your self* and *your Cause* in; as appears by your attempting this way, and that way to get out, and at last standing in the very middle of that *Circle* you thought your self out of. If his *Lordship* thought this *more a question of curiosity than necessity*, it was because out of his great Charity he supposed them to be *Christians* he had to deal with. But if his Charity were therein *deceived*, you shall see how able we are to make good the Grounds of our *Religion* against all *Adversaries*, whether *Papists* or others. And so far is the answering of this Question *from making the weakness of our Cause appear*, that I doubt not but to make it evident that our Cause stands upon the same Grounds which our common Christianity doth; and that we are *Protestants* by the same reason that we are *Christians.* And on the other side, that you are so far from giving *any true Grounds of Christian Faith*, that nothing will more advance the highest *Scepticism* and *Irreligion*, than such Principles as you insist on for resolving Faith. The true reason then, why the *Archbishop* declared any unwillingness to enter upon this Dispute, was not the least apprehension *how insuperably hard the resolution of this Question was* (as you pretend) but because of the great mischief your Party had done in starting such Questions, you could not resolve with any satisfaction to the common Reason of Mankind; and that you run your selves into such a *Circle* in which you *conjure* up more *Spirits* than you are ever able to *lay*, by giving those Advantages to Infidelity, which all your *Sophistry* can never answer on those Principles you go upon. That this was the true Ground of his Lordship's seeming Averseness from this Controversie, appears by his plain words, where he tells you at first, *of the danger of Men's being disputed into Infidelity by the Circle between Scripture and Tradition, and by his expressing his Sense of the great Harm you have done by the starting of that Question among Christians, How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God.* But although in this respect he might be said *to be drawn into it*, yet lest you should think his Averseness argued any Consciousness of his own Inability to answer it, you may see how closely he follows it; with what Care and Accuracy he handles it, with what strength of Reason and Evidence he hath discovered the weakness of your way, which he hath done with that success, that he hath put you to miserable shifts to avoid the force of his Arguments, as will appear afterwards. I am there-

§. 2.

P. 55.

Sect. 16. n. 1.

fore fully of his mind, *that it is a matter of ſuch conſequence it deſerves to be ſifted*, were it for no other end, but to lay open the Juglings and Impoſtures of your way of reſolving Faith.

§. 3. Ibid. Which we now come more cloſely to the diſcovery of; for, as you tell us, *The Biſhop propounding diverſe ways of reſolving the Queſtion, firſt falls to the attacking your way, who prove it by Tradition and Authority of the Church.* And his firſt Onſet is ſo ſucceſsful, that it makes you viſibly *recoil*, and withdraw your ſelf into ſo untenible a Shelter as expoſeth you to all the Attempts which any Adverſary would deſire to make upon you. For, whereas you are charged by his *Lordſhip with running into the moſt abſurd kind of Argumentation*, viz. *by proving the Scriptures Infallible by Tradition, and that Tradition Infallible by Scripture*; you think to eſcape that *Circle*, by telling us, *That you prove not the Churches Infallibility by the Scripture, but by the Motives of Credibility belonging to the Church.* This then being your main Principle which your following Diſcourſe is built upon, and in your judgment the *only probable way to avoid the Circle*, that you may not think I am afraid of encountering you in your greateſt Strength, I dare put the Iſſue of the Cauſe upon this Promiſe, that (beſides the weak Proofs you bring for the thing it ſelf, which ſhall after be conſidered) if this way of yours be not chargeable with all the Abſurdities ſuch an Attempt is capable of, I will be content to acknowledge what you ſay to be true, which is, *That your way of reſolving Faith hath no difficulty at all, and that ours is inſuperably hard*, which I think are as hard terms as can be impoſed upon me. Now there are two grand Abſurdities, which any vindication of an Opinion is ſubject to; firſt, *If it be manifeſtly unreaſonable*, and, 2. *If ſuppoſing it true, it doth not effect what it was intended for:* Now theſe *two* I undertake to make good againſt this *way of your reſolving Faith*, that it is guilty of the higheſt Unreaſonableneſs; and that, ſuppoſing it true, you are in a *Circle* as much as before.

1. Firſt, I begin with the *unreaſonableneſs* of it, which is ſo great, that I know not, whether I may abſtain from calling it *Ridiculous*; but, that I may not ſeem to follow you, in aſſerting confidently, and proving weakly, it will be neceſſary throughly to examine the *Grounds* on which your Opinion ſtands, and then raiſe our *Batteries* againſt it. Three grand *Principles* your Diſcourſe relies upon, which are your *Poſtulata* in order to the reſolving Faith.

1. That it is neceſſary to the believing the *Scriptures to be the Word of God with a Divine Faith*, that it be built on the infallible Teſtimony of the *Church*.

2. That your *Church* is that *Catholick Church* whoſe Teſtimony is *Infallible*.

3. That this *Infallibility* is to be known and aſſented to upon the *Motives of Credibility*. Theſe three, I ſuppoſe, if your confuſed Diſcourſe were reduced to Method, would be freely acknowledged by your ſelf to be the Principles on which *your Reſolution of Faith* depends. And although I am ſufficiently aſſured of the Falſeneſs of your two firſt *Principles* (as will appear in the Sequel of this Diſcourſe) yet that which I have now particularly undertaken, is, the *unreaſonableneſs of reſolving Faith* upon theſe Principles taken together, *viz. That the Infallible Teſtimony of your Church, is the only Foundation for Divine Faith; and that this Infallibility can be known only by the Motives of Credibility.* If then in this *way of reſolving Faith*, you require *Aſſent beyond all proportion of evidence*, if you *run into the ſame Abſurdities you would ſeem to avoid*, if you *leave Men more uncertain*

certain in their Religion than you found them; you cannot certainly excuse this way from *unreasonableness*. And each of these I undertake to make good against this *way* of yours, whereby you would assure Men of the *Truth* and *Divinity* of the *Scriptures*.

1. *An Assent is hereby required beyond all proportion or degree of Evidence*; for you require an *Infallible Assent*, only upon *probable Grounds*; which is as much as requiring Infallibility in the conclusion, where the Premises are only probable. Now that you require an Assent *Infallible* to the nature of Faith, appears by the whole *Series* of your Discourse: For, to this very end you require *Infallibility* in the *Testimony* of your *Church*, because otherwise, you say *Our Faith would be uncertain*; it is plain then, you require an *Infallible Assent* in Faith; and, it is as plain, that this *Assent*, according to you, can be built only upon *probable Grounds*, for you acknowledge the *Motives of Credibility*, to be no more than such; yet those are all the Grounds you give why the *Church* should be believed Infallible. If you say, *That which makes the Assent Infallible, is, that Infallibility which is in the Churches Testimony*; I reply, That this is a most unreasonable thing, to go about to establish an *Infallible Assent*, meerly because the *Testimony* is supposed to be in it self *Infallible*: For, *Assent* is not according to the *Objective Certitude* of things, but the *evidence* of them to our *Understandings*. For is it possible to assent to the truth of a Demonstration in a demonstrative manner, because any *Mathematician* tells one, The thing is demonstrable? For in that case the *Assent* is not according to the *Evidence* of the thing, but according to the opinion such a Person hath of him, who tells him, It is demonstrable. Nay, supposing that Person *infallible* in saying so, yet if the other hath no means to be *infallibly assured*, that he is so, such a one's *Assent* is as *doubtful*, as if he were not infallible: Therefore, supposing the *Testimony* of your *Church* to be really infallible, yet since the means of believing it are but *probable* and *prudential*, the Assent cannot be according to the *nature* of the *Testimony*, considered in it self, but according to the *Reasons* which induce me to believe such a Testimony infallible. And in all such cases, where I believe one thing for the sake of another, my *Assent* to the *Object* believed, is according to my Assent to the *Medium* on which I believe it; for by the means of that, the other is conveyed to our Minds. As our Sight is not according to the Light in the Body of the *Sun*, but that which presseth upon our Organs of Sense: So that, supposing your *Churches* Testimony to be in it self *infallible*, if one may be deceived in judging whether your *Church* be *infallible* or no, one may be deceived in such things which he believes upon that supposed *Infallibility*. It being an impossibility, that the *Assent* to the *Matters of Faith*, should rise higher, or stand firmer, than the Assent to the *Testimony* is, upon which those things are believed. Now, that one may be deceived according to your own Principles, in judging whether the *Church* be *Infallible*, appears by this, That you have no other means to prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, but only *probable* and *prudential Motives*. For, I desire to know, whether an *Infallible Assent* to the Infallibility of your *Church*, can be grounded on those *Motives of Credibility*? If you affirm it, then there can be no imaginable necessity to make the *Testimony* of your *Church Infallible*, in order to *Divine Faith*; for you will not, I hope, deny, but that there are at least equal *Motives of Credibility*, to prove the *Divine Authority* of the *Scriptures*, as the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; and, if so, why may not an *Infallible Assent* be given to the *Scriptures* upon those *Motives of Credibility*, as well as to your *Churches Infallibility*? If you deny the Assent built upon the *Motives of Credibility* to

§. 4.

to be *Infallible*; how can you make the Aſſent to your Churches Teſtimony to be *Infallible*, when that Infallibility is attempted to be proved only by the *Motives of Credibility*? And therefore it neceſſarily follows, That notwithſtanding your bearing it ſo high under the pretence of Infallibility, you leave Men's Minds much more wavering in their Aſſent than before; in that, as ſhall afterwards appear, theſe very *Motives of Credibility* do not at all prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, which undoubtedly prove the *Truth* and *Certainty* of *Chriſtian Religion*. Thus, while by this Device, you ſeek to avoid the *Circle*, you deſtroy the Foundation of your Diſcourſe, *That there muſt be an Infallible Aſſent to the Truth of that Propoſition, That the Scriptures are the Word of God* (which you call *Divine Faith*) which, how can it be *Infallible*, when that *Infallibility*, at the higheſt, by your own confeſſion, is but *evidently credible*, and ſo, I ſuppoſe the *Authority* of the *Scriptures* is, without your *Churches Infallibility*.

§. 5. And thus *you run into the ſame Abſurdities which you would ſeem to avoid*, which is the ſecond thing, to manifeſt the unreaſonableneſs of this way; for whatever *Abſurdity* you charge us with, for believing the *Doctrine of Chriſt* upon the *Motives of Credibility*, unavoidably falls upon your ſelves for believing the *Churches Infallibility* on the ſame Grounds: For if we leave the *Foundation of Faith uncertain*, you do ſo too; if we build a *Divine Faith upon the Motives of Credibility*, ſo do you; if we make *every one's Reaſon the Judge in the choice of his Religion*, ſo muſt you be forced to do, if you underſtand the Conſequence of your own Principles.

1. It is impoſſible for you to give *a better account of Faith by the Infallibility of your Church, than we can do without it*; For, if *Divine Faith* cannot be built upon the *Motives* proving the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, what Senſe or Reaſon is there, that it ſhould be built on thoſe *Motives* which prove your *Churches Infallibility*? So that, if we leave *the Foundation of Faith uncertain*, you much more; and that I prove by a Rule of much Authority with you, by which you uſe to pervert the weak judgments of ſuch, who in your caſe do not diſcern the *Sophiſtry* of it: Which is when you come to deal with Perſons, whom you hope to *Proſelyte*, you urge them with this great *Principle*, That *Prudence is to be our Guide in the choice of our Religion, and that Prudence directs us to chuſe the ſafeſt way, and that it is much ſafer to make choice of that way, which both ſides agree Salvation is to be obtained in, than of that which the other ſide utterly denies Men can be ſaved in.* How far this Rule will hold in the choice of Religion, will be examined afterwards: But if we take your word, that it is a ſure Rule; I know nothing will be more certainly advantageous to us, in our preſent caſe. For both ſides, I hope, are agreed, that there are *ſufficient Motives of Credibility*, as to the belief of the *Scriptures*; but we utterly deny that there are any ſuch *Motives* as to the *Infallibility* of your *Church*; it then certainly follows, That our way is the more eligible and certain, and that we lay a ſurer *Foundation for Faith*, than you do upon your Principles for reſolving Faith.

2. Either you muſt deny *any ſuch thing as that you call Divine Faith*; or you muſt aſſert, that it may have no other *Foundation* than the *Motives of Credibility*, which yet is that, you would ſeem moſt to avoid by introducing the *Infallibility of your Church, that the Foundation of Faith may not be uncertain*; whereas, ſuppoſing what you deſire, you muſt of neceſſity do what you would ſeem moſt fearful of, which is making a *Divine Faith to reſt upon prudential Motives*. Which I thus prove: It is an undoubted *Axiom* among the great men of your ſide, That *whatever is a Foundation for a Divine Faith, muſt it ſelf be believed with a firm, certain, and infallible Aſſent*:

Aſſent: Now, according to your principles, the *Infalibility* of the *Church* is the Foundation for Divine Faith; and therefore that muſt be believed with an *Aſſent infallible.* It is apparent then, an *Aſſent infallible* is required, which is that which in other terms you call *Divine Faith*; now when you make it your buſineſs to prove the *Churches Infallibility* upon your *prudential Motives*, I ſuppoſe your deſign is by thoſe proofs, to induce Men to believe it; and if Men then do believe it upon thoſe *Motives*, do you not found an *Aſſent Infallible*, or a *Divine Faith*, upon the *Motives of Credibility?* And by the ſame reaſon that you urge againſt us the neceſſity of believing *the Scriptures to be the word of God by Divine Faith*; becauſe it is the *ground* why we *believe the things contained in the Scripture*, we preſs on your ſide the neceſſity of believing the *Infalibility of the Church by a Faith equally Divine*, becauſe that it is to you the only ſufficient Foundation of believing the *Scriptures*, or any thing contained in them.

3. You make by this way of reſolving Faith, *every Mans reaſon the only Judge in the choice of his Religion:* which you are pleaſed to charge on us as a great *Abſurdity:* yet, you who have deſerved ſo *very ill* of *Reaſon*, are fain to call in her beſt aſſiſtance in a caſe of the greateſt moment, *viz. On what ground we muſt believe the Scriptures to be the word of God.* You, ſay, *Becauſe the Church is infallible, which delivers them to us?* but how ſhould we come to know that ſhe is infallible? you tell us, *By the Motives of Credibility*; very good: But muſt not every ones reaſon judge whether theſe *Motives* be *creaible* or no? and whether they belong peculiarly to your *Church*, ſo as to prove the *Infallibility* of it, as it is diſtinct from all other ſocieties of *Chriſtians* in the world? You tell us indeed, That theſe *Motives* make it *evidently credible*; but muſt we believe it to be ſo, *becauſe you ſay ſo?* If ſo; then the ground of *believing* is not the *Credibility* of the *Motives*, but of *your Teſtimony*, and therefore you ought to make it *evidently true*, that whatever you ſpeak is undoubtedly true, which whoſoever reads your Book, will hardly be perſwaded to. So that of neceſſity every *Mans reaſon* muſt be *Judge*, whether your *Church be infallible* or no; and thus at laſt you give Reaſon the *Umpirage* in the choice of Religion. And what is there more than this that we contend for? If there be then any danger of *Scepticiſm*, a *private ſpirit*, or what other inconveniencies you object againſt our way of judging the truth of *Religion* by *the Uſe of Reaſon*, it will fall much more heavily upon our ſelves, in this way of believing the *Infallibility of the Church* on the *Motives of Credibility.* Therefore I aſſure you, it were much more conſonant to the principles of your party, to tell Men, *The Infallibility of your Church ought to be taken for granted, and that Men are damned for not believing it, though no reaſon be given for it, but only becauſe you ſay it* (which is as much as to ſay, the reaſon of the Point is, It muſt needs be ſo) than thus to expoſe it to the ſcorn and contempt of the world, by offering to prove it by your *Motives of Credibility.* For unawares you thereby give away the main of your Cauſe; for by the very offer of proving it, you make *him* whom you offer to prove it to, *judge* whether theſe *proofs be ſufficient or no?* and if he be capable to *judge* of his *Guide*, certainly he may be of his *Way* too, conſidering that he hath, according to us, an *Infallible Rule* to judge of his Way; whereas, according to you, he hath but *Prudential Motives* in the choice of his Guide. Thus, by this Opinion of yours, you have gained thus much, That there is nothing ſo *abſurd*, which you charge upon us, but it falls unavoidably upon your own head.

By this way of reſolving Faith, you undermine it, and leave a ſure Foun- §. 6.
dation for nothing but *Scepticiſm*; which is the laſt thing to ſhew the great

unreaſo-

unreaſonableneſs of this way of yours, that when you are making us believe you are taking the greateſt care to make our *Religion ſure*, you *cancel* our beſt *evidences*, and produce nothing but *crack'd and broken titles*, which will not ſtand any fair tryal at the *bar of Reaſon*. And that you make the Foundations of Religion uncertain, I offer to prove *by the reaſon of the thing*; for, if you require that as neceſſary for Faith, which was never believed to be ſo, when the Doctrine of Faith was revealed; if upon the pretence of *Infallibility* you aſſert ſuch things, which deſtroy all the *rational* evidence of *Chriſtian Religion*, and if at laſt you are far from giving the leaſt ſatisfactory account concerning this *Infallibility of your Church*; then certainly we may juſtly charge you with *unſettling the Foundation of Religion*, inſtead of giving us a *certain reſolution of Faith*.

1. *You make that neceſſary to Faith, which was not looked on as ſuch, when the Doctrine of the Goſpel was revealed*; and what other deſign can ſuch a pretence ſeem to have, than to expoſe to contempt that *Religion* which was not received by a *true Divine Faith*, becauſe it wanted that, which is now thought to be the only *ſure Foundation of Faith*, viz. *the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome? What then will become of the *Faith* of all thoſe who received *Divine Revelations*, without the *Infallible Teſtimony of any Church at all?* With what *Faith* did the *Diſciples* of *Chriſt* at the time of his ſufferings, believe the *Divine Authority of the Old Teſtament?* was it a *true Divine Faith* or not? If it *was*, whereon was it built? not certainly on the *Infallible Teſtimony of the Jewiſh Church*, which at that time conſented to the *death of the Meſſiah*, condemning him as a malefactor and deceiver: Or did they believe it becauſe of that great *Rational Evidence* they had to convince them, that thoſe *Prophecies* came from *God?* If ſo, why may not we believe the *Divinity* of all the *Scriptures* on the ſame grounds, and with a *Divine Faith* too: With what *Faith* did thoſe believe in the *Meſſiah*, who were not perſonally preſent at the *Miracles* which our *Saviour* wrought, but had them conveyed to them by ſuch reports as the *Woman of Samaria* was to the *Samaritans?* Or were all ſuch perſons excuſed from believing, meerly becauſe they were not *Spectators*? But by the ſame reaſon all thoſe would be excuſed, who never ſaw our *Saviour*'s miracles, or heard his Doctrine, or his *Apoſtles*: But if ſuch perſons then were bound to believe, I ask On what Teſtimony was their *Faith* founded? Was the *Woman of Samaria infallible*, in reporting the diſcourſe between *Chriſt* and her? Were all the perſons *infallible*, who gave an account to others of what *Chriſt* did; yet, I ſuppoſe, had it been your own caſe, you would have thought your ſelf bound to have believed *Chriſt* to have been the *Meſſias*, if you had lived at that time, and a certain account had been given you of our *Saviour's Doctrine* and *Miracles* by men faithful and honeſt, though you had no reaſon to have believed them *Infallible*: I pray, Sir, anſwer me, would you have thought your ſelf bound to have believed, or no? If you affirm it (as I will ſuppoſe you ſo much a Chriſtian as to ſay ſo) I pray then tell me, whether perſons in thoſe circumſtances might not have a *True and Divine Faith*, where there was no *infallible Teſtimony*, but only *Rational Evidence* to build it ſelf upon? And if thoſe perſons might have a *Divine Faith* upon ſuch evidence as that was, may not we much more, who have evidence of the *ſame nature* indeed, but much more *extenſive*, *univerſal*, and *convincing* than that was? And how then can you ſtill aſſert an *infallible Teſtimony* of the conveyers of *Divine Revelation*, to be neceſſary to a *Divine Faith?* Nay further yet, How very few were there in compariſon, in the firſt *Ages* of the *Chriſtian Church*, who received the Doctrine of the *Goſpel* from the mouths of perſons infallible? And of thoſe who

who did so, what certain evidence have men, That all those persons did receive the Doctrine upon the account of the *Infallibility* of the propounders, and not rather upon the *Rational Evidence* of the *Truth of the Doctrine* delivered, and whether the belief of their *Infallibility* was absolutely necessary to Faith, when the report of the *Evidences* of the *Truth* of the Doctrine might raise in them an obligation to believe, supposing them not *infallible* in that delivery of it; but that they looked on them as honest Men, who faithfully related, *What they had seen and heard.* And this seems the more probable, in that the *Apostles* themselves, in their undoubtedly divine writings, do so often appeal to their own *sufficiency* and *integrity*, without pleading so much their *Infallibility.* S. *John* saith, *That which we have seen and heard, and handled, declare we unto you.* S. *Peter* appeals to his being *an Eye-witness*, to make it appear he delivered *no cunningly devised fables.* S. *Luke* makes this a ground, *That the things were surely believed, because delivered from them who were Eye witnesses and Ministers of the Word.* If they insisted so much upon this *Rational Evidence*, and so sparingly on their own *Infallibility*; certainly they thought the one afforded a good foundation for *Faith*, though the other, after believing it, might highly advance it. And therefore I suggest not these things, in the least, to question the *Infallibility* of the *Apostles*, but to let us see, that even at that time, when there was a *certain infallible Testimony*, yet that is not urged as the only foundation for Faith, but *Rational Evidence* produced even by those persons who were thus infallible. If we descend lower in the *Christian Church*, or walk abroad to view the several *Plantations* of the *Churches* at that time, Where do we read or meet with the least intimation of an *infallible Testimony* of the *Catholick Church*; so call'd from its *Communion* with that of *Rome?* What infallible Testimony of that *Church* had the poor *Britains* to believe on? or those *Barbarians* mentioned in *Irenæus*, who yet believed without a *written word?* What mention do we meet with, in all the ancient *Apologeticks* of *Christians*, wherein they give so large an account of the grounds of *Christian Faith*, of the modern method for *resolving Faith?* Nay, what one ancient *Father* or *Council* give the least countenance to this pretended *Infallibility*, much less make it the only sure *Foundation of Faith*, as you do? Nay, how very few are there among yourselves who believe it, and yet think themselves never the worse *Christians* for it? If then your *Doctrine* be true, what becomes of the *Faith* of all these persons mentioned? Upon your principles their *Faith* could not be a *true and Divine Faith*; that is, *Let them all think they believed the Doctrine of Christ never so heartily, and obeyed it never so conscientiously; yet because they did not believe it on the Infallibility of your Church, their Faith was but a kind of gilded and splendid Infidelity, and none of them Christians, because not Jesuits.* And doth not this principle then fairly advance *Christianity* in the world, when the belief of it comes to be settled on Foundations never heard of in the best and purest times of it; nay, such Foundations, as for want of their believing them, their *Faith must be all in vain, and Christ dyed in vain for them?*

1 Joh. 1. 1. 2 Pet. 1. 16. Luk. 1. 1, 2.

2. You assert such things upon the pretence of Infallibility, *which destroy all the rational evidence of Christian Religion:* And what greater dis-service could you possibly do to it, than by taking away all the proper grounds of *certainty* of it? And, instead of building it *super hanc Petram*, upon the *Rock of Infallibility*, you do it only upon a *Quick-sand*, which *swallows* up the *Edifice*, and *sucks* in the *Foundations* of it. You would have men to believe the Infallibility of your *Church*, that their *Faith* might stand upon § 7.

ſure *grounds*; and yet, if men believe this *Infallibility of your Church*, you require ſuch things to be believed upon it, which deſtroy all kind of *certainty in Religion*. And that I prove by ſome of thoſe principles which are received among you upon the account of the *Churches Infallibility*.

1. *That the judgment of Senſe is not to be relied on, in matters of Faith:* This is the great Principle upon which the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* ſtands in your *Church*; and this is all, the moſt conſiderative Men among you have to ſay, when all thoſe *Contradictions* are offered to them, which that Doctrine is ſo *big* of, both to the judgment of ſenſe and reaſon, *viz. That though it ſeem ſo contradictory; yet becauſe the Church, which is infallible, delivers it, they are bound not to queſtion it.* If this Principle then be true, That the judgment of ſenſe is not to be relyed on, in matters which ſenſe is capable of judging of; it will be impoſſible for any one to give any ſatisfactory account of the grand *Foundations of Chriſtian Faith*. For if we carefully examine the *grounds of Certainty in Chriſtian Religion*, we find the great appeal made to the *judgment of Senſe*, (*That which we have ſeen, and heard, and handled.*) If then the judgment of *Senſe* muſt not be taken in a *proper object*, at *due diſtance*, and in ſuch a thing wherein *all Mens Senſes* are equally judges; I pray, tell me what aſſurance the *Apoſtles* could have, or any from them, of any *miracles* which *Chriſt* wrought, of any *Doctrine* which he preached; eſpecially becauſe in his *miracles* there was ſomething above nature, in which caſe Men are more apt to ſuſpect *Impoſtures*, than in things which are the continual *Objects of Senſe*, as in the caſe of *Tranſubſtantiation?* Wherein, if Men are not bound to rely on the judgment of Senſe, you muſt ſay, that *our Faculties are ſo made*, that they may be impoſed upon, in the proper *Objects* of them; and if ſo, farewel all *Certainty*, not only in *Religion*, but in all things elſe in the world. For what aſſurance can I have of the knowledge of any thing, if I find that my *Faculties* not only may be, but I am bound to believe that they *actually are*, deceived in a thing that is as proper an *Object of Senſe*, as any in the world. And if a thing, which the judgment of all mankind (thoſe excepted who have given away their ſenſe and reaſon in this preſent caſe) doth unanimouſly concur in, may be *falſe*; What evidence can we have, when any thing is *true?* For, if a thing ſo plain and evident to our *Senſes* may be *falſe*, *viz.* That *what I and all other Men ſee, is bread*, what ground of *certainty* can we have, but that which my *Senſes*, and all other Mens judge to be *falſe*, may be *true?* for by this means you take away the κειτήειον both of *Senſe* and *Reaſon* in *things*, and conſequently, *all things are equally true and falſe to us*; and thence it follows, That *Truth* and *Falſhood* are but *Fancies*, that our *Faculties* have no means to difference the one from the other, that in things we all agree in, as proper objects of *Senſe*, we not only may be, but are deceived; and then farewel *Senſe*, *Reaſon and Religion together*. For I pray, Tell me what *Aſſurance* could the *Apoſtles* have of the *Reſurrection of Chriſt's Individual Body* from the grave, but the *Judgment of Senſe?* What ways did he uſe to convince them, that he was not a *Spectre* or *Apparition*, but by an appeal to their *Senſes?* by what means did he reclaim *Thomas* from his Infidelity, but by bidding him make uſe of his *Senſes?* If *Thomas* had believed *Tranſubſtantiation*, he would eaſily have anſwered our *Saviours* Argument, and told him, If there were not a *productive*, yet there might be an *Adductive Tranſmutation* of ſome other perſon into him: and the Diſciples might all have ſaid, It was *true*, there were *the accidents of Chriſt's Body*, the *external ſhape and figure* of it; but, for all they could diſcern, there might be ſome *Inviſible Spirit* under thoſe

external

external Accidents of Shape: And therefore they must desire to be excused from believing it *to be his Body*; for, *Hoc est corpus meum*, had told them already; *That the external Accidents might remain, where the Substance was changed.* Now therefore, when the Assurance of *Christian Religion* came from the judgment of the Senses of those who were *Eye-witnesses* of the *Miracles* and the *Resurrection of Christ*; if the Senses of Men may be so grossly deceived in the proper *Objects* of them in the case of *Transubstantiation*, what assurance could they themselves have, who were *Eye-witnesses* of them? And how much less assurance can we heve, who have all our *Evidence* from the certainty of their Report? So that it appears upon the whole, that, take away the certainty of the *Judgment of Sense*, you destroy all *Certainty in Religion*; for, Tradition only conveys to us now, what was originally grounded upon the *Judgment of Sense*, and delivers to us in an undoubted manner, that which the *Apostles saw and heard.* And do not you then give a very good account of Religion by the Infallibility of your *Church*; when, if I believe your *Church* to be infallible, I must by virtue of that Infallibility, believe something to be *true*, which if it be *true*, there can be no *certainty* at all of the *Truth* of *Christian Religion.*

2. Another Principle is, *That we can have no certainty of any of the grounds of Faith, but from the Infallibility of your present Church.* Whereby *you* do these two things. 1. Destroy the *Obligation* to *Faith* which ariseth from the *rational Evidence of Christian Religion.* 2. Put the whole *stress* of the *Truth of Christianity* upon the proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*; by which things any one may easily see what tendency your Doctrine of *resolving Faith* hath, and how much it designs the overthrow of *Christianity.* 1. You destroy the *Obligation to Faith from the rational Evidence of Christian Religion*, by telling Men, as you do expressly in the very Title of your *next Chapter, That there can be no unquestionable Assurance of Apostolical Tradition, but from the infallible Authority of the present Church.* If so, then Men cannot have any unquestionable assurance that there was such a *Person* as *Christ* in the World, that he wrought such grat *Miracles* for confirmation of his Doctrine, that he *dyed and rose again*; it seems we can have no assurance of these things if the *present Church* be not Infallible. And if we can have no assurance of them, what *Obligation* can lie upon us to believe them? for, *assurance* of the *matters of fact*, which are the *foundations* of *Faith*, is necessary in order to the obligation to believe; I mean such an assurances as matters of fact are capable of; for no higher can be required than the nature of things will bear. And what a strange assertion then is this, that *matters of Fact* cannot be conveyed to us in an unquestionable manner, unless the present *Church* stamp her Infallibility upon them? Cannot we have an unquestionable assurance that there were such Persons as *Cæsar* and *Pompey*, and that they did such and such things without some infallible Testimony? If we may in such things, why not in other *matters of fact* which infinitely more concern the World to know than whatever *Cæsar* or *Pompey* did? But this will be more at lagre examined afterwards; I only now take notice of the consequence of this Principle, and how fairly it destroys all *rational Evidence* of the Truth of our Religion; which whosoever takes away will be by force of Reason, a *Sceptick* in the first place, and an *Infidel* in the second. Neither is the danger meerly in destroying the rational Evidence of Religion; but, 2. In putting the whole weight of Religion upon the proofs of the *present Churches* Infallibility, which whosoever considers how silly and weak they are, cannot sufficiently wonder at the design of those Men, who put the *most excellent Religion* in the World, and which is built upon

§. 8.

the higheſt and trueſt *Reaſon*, to ſuch a ſtrange kind of *Ordeal Tryal*, that if ſhe paſs not through this St. *Winifred's Needle*, her Innocency muſt be ſuſpected, and her Truth condemned. So that whoſoever queſtions the truth of this kind of *Purgation*, will have a greater ſuſpicion of a Juggle and *Impoſture* if ſhe be acquitted, than if ſhe had never ſubmitted to ſuch a Tryal. And when we come to examine the Proofs brought for this *Infallibility*, it will then further appear, what *uncertainty* in *Religion* Men are betrayed to, under this confident Pretext of *Infallibility*. Thus we ſee what *Scepticiſm* in Religion the Principles owned upon the account of Infallibility, do bring Men to.

§. 9. 3. When you have brought Men to this, that the only ſure Ground of Faith is the *Infallibility of your Church*, you are not able to give them any ſatisfactory account at all concerning it; but plunge them into greater *uncertainties* than ever they were in before. For you can neither ſatisfie them what that *Church* is which you ſuppoſe *Infallible*, what in that *Church* is the proper *Subject* of this *Infallibility*, what *kind* of *Infallibility* this is, or how we ſhould *know* when the *Church* doth decide *Infallibility*, and when not; and yet every one of theſe Queſtions is no leſs than abſolutely neceſſary to be reſolved, in order to the Satisfaction of Men's Minds, as to the *Foundation of their Faith*.

1. You cannot ſatisfie Men what that *Church is which you ſuppoſe to be Infallible*. Certainly, if you had a deſign to give Men a certain Foundation for their *Faith*, you would not be ſo *ſhy* of diſcovering what it is you underſtand by that *Church* which you would have *Infallible*; if you had meant *honeſtly*, the firſt thing you ſhould have done was to have prevented all miſtakes concerning the meaning of the *Church*, when you know what various Significations it hath, not only in *Scripture*, but among your *ſelves*. Whether you mean the *Church Eſſential*, *Repreſentative*, or *Vertual*, for every one of theſe upon occaſion you make uſe of: And it was never more neceſſary to have explained them than in this place, and yet you with wonderful Care and Induſtry avoid any intimation of what you mean by that *Church* which you would prove Infallible. When you plead ſo earneſtly for the *Churches Infallibility*, I pray tell us what you mean by the *Church*; do you intend the truly *Catholick* and *Univerſal Church* which comprehends in it all ſuch as own and profeſs the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, in which ſenſe it was well ſaid by *Abulenſis*. *Eccleſia univerſalis nunquam erat, quia nunquam tota errat, The univerſal Church never erres, becauſe the whole Church is never deceived.* Or, do you mean by your *Catholick Church* ſome particular *part* of it, to which you apply the name of *Catholick* not for *Univerſality* of extent, but *ſoundneſs of Doctrine?* Then it will be neceſſary yet further, to ſhew what part of the *Church* that is, by what *Right* and *Title* that hath *engroſſed* the name of *Catholick*, ſo as to exclude other Societies of *Chriſtians* from it; and whether you muſt not firſt prove the abſolute Integrity and Soundneſs of her Doctrine, before you can attribute this Title to it. For otherwiſe you will find that marvellouſly true, which the ſame *Toſtatus* ſaith, *Eccleſia Latinorum non eſt Eccleſia Univerſalis ſed quædam pars ejus: ideò etiamſi tota ipſa errâſſet, non errabat Eccleſia Univerſalis, quia manet Eccleſia Univerſalis in partibus illis quæ non errant, ſiveillæ ſint numero plures quàm errantes, ſive non.* So that if you prove the Infallibility of the *Catholick Church*, this proves nothing at all as to the *Roman Church*, which at moſt can be ſuppoſed to be but a *part* of it, and though that ſhould err, the *Catholick Church* might not err, becauſe that remains in thoſe parts which *err not*, though they be more or leſs in number than thoſe that err. This is the ſenſe of his words;

Praefat. in Mat. quæſt. 13.

Queſt. 4. in Matth. ad proleg. 2.

who

who seemed to have a much truer conception of the *Universal Church*, than those now of your *Sect* and *Party*. If then we may believe the *Church* to be *infallible*, and yet, in the mean time, condemn your *Church* for the grossest *Errors*: Will it not be found necessary for you, to tell us yet more distinctly, What you mean by the *Church* you would prove Infallible? But, supposing that only those parts you esteem *Catholick*, make up the *Catholick Church*, even among them the Question will still return, What you mean by this *Catholick Church*? Do you mean all the *Individual Persons* in this number, taken either *distributively* or *collectively*? Or, Do you mean, *all those* who are entrusted with the Government of these? And then, Whether all *Inferior Pastors*, or only *Bishops*? And if *Bishops*, Whether all those *collectively*, or else by way of *Representation in a Council*? And still remember to make it good, that what you pitch upon as the acception of the *Church*, be not an effect of humane Policy, as *Albertus Pighius* said. *All Councils were no more*; but that what you fasten the Acception of the *Church Catholick* upon, you be sure to make it out, that is the *Catholick Church* to whom the *Promises* are made in *Scripture*: And, be sure to tell us, How a *Church* comes to be infallible by *Representation*? Whether as they, who make the *Church representative*, deliver the Sense of the *Church* they *represent*; or by an immediate *Promise* made to them upon their Convention. If the former, Whether it will not be necessary, in order to the *Infallibility* of the *Council*, to know, that it speaks the sense of all those particular *Churches* whom they represent: If the latter, you must remember such *places* as belong to them, as representing the *Church*; for otherwise any company of *Christians* assembled together, will challenge an equal interest in them; and then you will find it a hard matter to prove one *Infallible*, and not the other. But, if after all this, your *Windmill* should dwindle into a *Nutcracker*, and this *Harrangue* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Catholick Church*, should at last end in one *particular Person*; which by a strange *Catrchresis*, must be call'd the *Church*, or else, as *Heir* at *Law* to her, doth take possession of all her Privileges. Then the *Testament* must be produced wherein he is named so, and those Clauses especially, wherein the Rights and Privileges of *her* are devolved over to *him* and *his Heirs for ever*. There being then so much ambiguity and uncertainty in the very name of the *Church Catholick*, which you would prove infallible, that if nothing else discovered your *Imposture*, yet this would sufficiently, that you would undertake to resolve *Men's Faith by the Infallibility of the Church*, and yet never offer to shew what that *Church* is.

2. Supposing you had shewn what the *Church* is, yet you never tell us what the *Subject of Infallibility is in that Church*. For, when in this case you speak of *Infallibility*, you must remember you are not to shew what that *Church* is, which is not deceived in judging concerning things necessary to Salvation, but what the *Church* is, which is infallible in her *Direction* of others to Salvation: For, you speak of such an Infallibility as must be a *Guide* to others, and whose infallible *judgment* must be known to all such who must *resolve their Faith into her Testimony*: You would have done then no more than was absolutely necessary to have precisely shewn us where this Infallibility is lodged in your *Church*; whether in *Pope* or *Council*, or both together. I suppose it can be no news either to you, or to the Reader, what *Controversies* there are among the greatest of your side, whether the *Pope* or *Council* be the *greater*, and to whom this *Infallibility* belongs; neither are either side fully agreed in their own way, for some that are for the *Infallibility* of a General *Council*, will make that *Infallible* without the

Pope,

Pope, others account that opinion, if not *Heretical*, the *next ſtep* to it. Thoſe who are for the *Pope's Infallibility*, are not agreed neither when he ſhall be ſaid to be *Infallible*; They who ſpeak *Oracles*, tell us, when he doth define *ex Cathedrâ*, but what that is, neither they nor we can well tell; ſome ſay it is, when he hath a *Congregation of choſen Cardinals* about him, others make the *whole Colledge of Cardinals* neceſſary, and therefore ſome in the late Definition concerning the *Janſeniſts* were refractory, becauſe it was defined only by a *Congregation of choſen Cardinals*, which they ſaid, was not defining *ex Cathedrâ*: Some again make neither of theſe neceſſary, but ſuppoſe the Infallibility lodged in the *Pope* himſelf. And are we not at a fine *paſs* for the certainty of our Faith, if it muſt rely upon the infallible Teſtimony of your *Church*; and yet you your ſelves not at all agreed to whom this *Infallible Teſtimony* doth belong? Think not that we will be put off with that ſilly Evaſion, *That theſe Differences among you hinder not the certainty of Faith, becauſe it is not* de fide *either way*. For, 1. How ſhall we come to know among you what is *de fide*, and what not, till you are agreed to whom this *Infallibility* belongs? And if it belongs to a *General Council*, then it is *de fide*; for it was determined at the *Council* of *Baſil*, in behalf of the *Council*, and therefore if one of the Opinions be true, it muſt be *de fide*; for, I ſuppoſe you make that to be ſo, which is determined by the infallible Teſtimony of your *Church*. 2. How ſhall a Man believe, that any thing at all is *de fide* among you, if that on which your *Faith* is to reſt, be not *de fide*? For, ſuppoſing a Difference to happen, which hath often done between the *Pope* and *Council*, and they decree contrary things to each other, if it be not *de fide*, to believe either the one or the other diſtinctly to be infallible, upon what Teſtimony at ſuch a time muſt that which ſuppoſeth the infallible *Teſtimony* of *your Church* rely? 3. If it be ſaid not to be *de fide*, becauſe not determined; by the ſame reaſon your *Churches Infallibility* cannot be *de fide*, becauſe not determined neither: For, if the Determination of the *Church* be neceſſary to make any thing *de fide*, it muſt by the ſame reaſon be neceſſary to make your *Churches Infallibility* de fide; and, I ſuppoſe, you will not readily inſtance in any Decree of the *Catholick Church*, where the Teſtimony of your *Church* is determined to be *Infallible*. And yet one would imagine, that if there were ſuch a neceſſity in order to *Faith*, of the *Infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church*, there would be an equal neceſſity of believing this *Infallibility* on the ſame Teſtimony: Or if one may believe one Article, eſpecially ſo important a one as that, without any precedent *Infallible Teſtimony*, why not any other, nay, why not all the reſt? Thus you ſtill ſee, how *Uncertainties* grow upon us, when we ſearch into your account of Faith.

3. You are not certain neither, *What kind of Infallibility this is*; For you
P. 55. n. 1. offer to prove the Church *Infallible*, by the ſame way that *Moſes*, *Chriſt*, *and his Apoſtles were proved Infallible*: A very fair Offer, if you could make it good; but then we were in hopes you would have proved ſuch a *kind of Infallibility* as they had; you tell us, *No*: For your Infallibility is *Supernatural*,
P. 58. n. 4. but *not Divine*; that it is *preciſe Infallibility*, but *not abſolute*, that it is not by *immediate Revelation*, but by *immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*: Something you would have, but you cannot tell what; an *Infallibility* in the *Concluſion*, without any in the *uſe* of *means*; an Infallibility by *immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*, yet but in a *ſort Divine*; an Infallibility yielding nothing to *Scripture* in point of *Supernaturality* and *Certainty*, yet nothing ſo *Infallible* as *Scripture*. Are not theſe brave things to make wiſe Men certain in their Religion with! that they are to believe the *Scriptures* upon a Teſti-

Testimony *infallible*, yet not *infallible*; *divine*, yet not *divine*; and therefore *certain*, but not *certain*; *true*, but not *true*. But of the fillinesse of these Distinctions, afterwards. But, can you think to perswade wise or rational men to believe their *Religion* on such terms as these are? Had they no other evidence than what you give them, would they not be shrewdly tempted to reject all Religion, as a meer *Imposture*, as no doubt your Doctrine of *Infallibility* is? A strange kind of *Talisman*, which secures your *Pope* from a possibility of erring, but still he must be under the *certain direction of his Stars*; for, if he be not *in Cathedrâ*, this *Telesm* doth him no good at all. It were heartily to be wished, if he should once happen to be *in Cathedrâ*, he would infallibly determine what it was to be *in Cathedrâ* for ever after; for it would ease Mens minds of a great many troublesome scruples, which they cannot, without some infallible Determination, get themselves quit of. But still *we are bound to believe your Church Infallible*: But, I pray, whence comes this Infallibility? *Comes it from Heaven, or is it of Men? From Heaven*, no doubt, you say; for it is *by a promise of the Holy Ghost*. This were something, if it were proved; but yet you maintain this *Infallibility* in such a manner, that none who read the *Scriptures* could ever think, it were promised there. For there they always read, *That the Spirit of Truth is a Spirit of Holiness, and never dwells in those who are carnal or wicked men*; but, you tell us: That let the lives of *Popes* be what they will; they have no *promise* to secure them from being *wicked*, but the *Spirit of God* doth by *immediate Assistance* secure them from being *fallible*. But, I pray, which of these two is not only more contrary to *Scripture*, but to *Humane Nature*; *Wickedness* or *Fallibility*? This latter, so consequent upon the imperfection of our understandings, that, till we put off the one, we can hardly be freed from the other; but *Wickedness* is that which the whole design of *Christian Religion* is against, and administers the highest *Motives*, and the greatest *Assistance* for the conquest of; and can it then be thought suitable to such a *Doctrine*, that the *Divine Spirit* should, like *Mahomet*'s *Dove*, be always ready to *whisper* in the ear of the most *profligate Person*, if it be but his fortune to sit in *Cathedrâ*? Such a kind of *Infallibility* as this, I assure you, will never prevail with any such persons, who understand *Christian Religion*, to believe the *Doctrine* of it upon such pretences as yours are.

4. Supposing, you could tell Men intelligibly and suitably to the Doctrine of *Christianity*, What *kind of infallibility this is*; yet if you cannot satisfie them, *when your Church doth define infallibly*, you leave them still in the same *Labyrinth*, without any clue to direct them out of it. But, if we consider what things are necessary to be believed, before we can believe any definition of your *Church infallible*, how impossible it is to be *infallibly assured* of any such definition of your *Church*, sure you cannot blame us for crying out of the *Labyrinth* you have brought us into. §. 10.

1. How many things in *Christian Religion* are to be believed, before we can imagine any such thing as an *infallible Testimony of your Church*? And if the *Infallibility* of that be the *ground* of *Faith*, on what account must those things be *believed*, which are antecedent to the belief of such an *infallible Testimony*? Now, that many things, and some of them far from being clear, are to be believed antecedently to an *infallible Testimony*, will appear; if we do but consider what they commonly mean by that *Church*, which they suppose *infallible*, and what must be supposed, that this *Infallibility* be the *Rule* of Faith. By the *Church*, they tell you, they mean the *Catholick Church*: but lest you should think them too honest in saying so, at next

word

word it is, the *Roman Catholick Church* (just as if one should say the *German-Universal Emperour.*) But lest you should think at least they meant the *Roman Church of all Ages*, and think you might have some relief from the *Primitive Roman Church*, they will soon rectifie your mistakes, by telling you, it is the *present Roman Church* they mean; but if it be the *present Roman-Church*, it may be you would be willing to hear the judgment of *all the honest Men in that Church*, and that you hope many of the people and learned Men (not in *Orders*) may speak their minds freely. To prevent that, they tell you they mean only *the representative Church.* But still the *Bishops*, who make up this *representative Church*, may in their several *Synods* complain of abuses, and rectifie miscarriages; therefore they understand not *Bishops by themselves*, or *particular Synods*, but met together in *General Councils.* But yet, if the *Councils* were truly *Oecumenical*, there might be some hopes of redress. But for that they are sure; for they allow none to be members of the *General Councils*, which are in *Schism* or *Heresie*; and their own *Church* is to be Judge, what *Schism* and *Heresie* is; and they are hugely to blame then, if they admit any but those of their own party. But yet, some *Councils* have stood upon their privileges in opposition to the *Pope*, as those of *Constance* and *Basil.* Therefore, to make all sure, no *Council* is lawful in it self, or its decrees bind the *Church*, but such as is *call'd* and *confirmed by the Pope:* who is strangely to blame then, if he suffers any thing to pass to his own prejudice: So that this *Infallibility* of the *Pope*, is the *last resort* in the *resolution of Faith*; for all the rest, we see, are uncertain. And what a vast measure of *Faith* (greater than that which our *Saviour* said, would remove mountains) is necessary to *believe* this *Infallibility* of the *Pope?* for in the first place, unless he believes the particular *Roman-Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, he spoils all the *Conjuring* afterwards, with not having *Faith* enough *about him.* Again, he must *believe*, that *Christ* hath promised an *Infallible Assistance to the Pastors of the Church as distinct from the People*; but this avails little still, unless he believes these *Credentials* must not be opened, but in *full Council*; and that *Council* such a one as the *Pope* calls, and in which *himself presides*, either in *Person*, or by his *Legates*, and that the *Decrees* of the *Council* oblige not the *Church*, without the *Pope's Confirmation*; and to that end you must believe, that S. *Peter* was made *Monarch of the Church by Christ*; that this *Monarchy* was to be derived to all his *Successors* in all places; but as to this (wherever he was besides) he never had any Successor any where but at *Rome:* And these Successors of his at *Rome*, cannot for their *lives* err, if they do but sit *in Cathedrâ.* Certainly he that hath *Faith* to swallow all these things, is hugely to blame if he *stick* at any thing; and by that time a Man's understanding is *debauch'd* sufficiently by these Principles, I make no question but such a one will believe *Infallibility*, *Transubstantiation*, or any thing in the world. But beside these things, in order to the making the *Churches Testimony the Rule of Faith* to any one, there must another *dose* of *Principles* be taken, which have *Opium* enough in them to lay *asleep* all the remainders of reason: For he must infallibly believe the *Church* to be *infallible*, though no *infallible Argument* be brought for the proof of it; That this *Church* doth judicially and authoritatively *pronounce* her *Sentence* in matters of Faith, though we know not what that *Church* is, which must so pronounce; That he infallibly know that this particular *Sentence* was *so pronounced*, though he can have no other than *Moral Means* of knowing it; And lastly, That the *Infallibility* must be the first *thing believed*, although all *these things* must of necessity be *believed* before it. And if after this *second Purgation*, he be not a true *Son* of the *Church* of *Rome*,

he

he deserves to be *Anathematized* as an obstinate Person, for having any thing of *Reason* in him. Therefore I wonder not that the Doctrine of *Infallibility* seems no strange thing to you; for a Man must devour such *Giant-like Absurdities*, before he comes to it, that when he comes at it, he finds it *nothing*. But still, one would think it a little strange, that this *Infallibility* should be the only *Foundation* of believing all things in *Religion*; and yet *so many things*, and some of them very *strange ones*, must of necessity be certainly believed before it.

2. Supposing a Man not only believes all these things before it, but doth *really believe your Church Infallible*, yet he is *uncertain* still how he should know *when your Church defines Infallibly*. For so many things are required in reference to the *Person defining*, so many for the *definition it self*, that it will be no easie matter to remove those difficulties which lie in the way of his Assent to such a Definition. As to the *Person*, if he be not a *Christian*, if he be not a *Priest*, if not a *Lawful Pope*, all his *Definitions* are far from being *Infallible*; yet none of all these can any one be assured of according to your Principles of *the intention of the Priest being necessary in the Administration of Sacraments, in order to the effect of them.* (But the large train of Consequences following from hence, I forbear to urge you with, because they have been so often urged by *abler Pens.*) But, What will you say, when we are so far from assurance, as to the *Pope's* being *legally chosen*, that we have, if not *great Evidence*, yet very *high Presumptions* of the contrary, what becomes then of your *Pope's* Infallibility? Nay, from the *Illegality* of one, follows the *Illegality* of all his Successors, because they were chosen by *Cardinals*, made by him; who could be no lawful *Cardinals*, because he was no *legal Pope*, and consequently not they who were made by them. The case is this; There is a *Bull* of *Pope Julius the Second*, against the *Simoniacal Election* of any *Pope*, which the *Cardinals*, upon their first entrance into the *Conclave*, swear solemnly to observe. In which *Bull* it is expresly said, That *if any Pope be Simoniacally chosen by any of the Cardinals, upon any gift or promise whatsoever, that such an Election is* ipso facto *null; and the Cardinals may oppose one so chosen, as if guilty of manifest Heresie; and that none ought to receive or look on such a one as Pope; neither can this Simoniacal Election be made good by inthronization, course of time, submission of Cardinals*, &c. *And that they ought all to avoid him as a Magician, Heathen, Publican, or the Founder of Heresie.* This is the substance of that *Bull*. Now it is notoriously known, that *Sixtus the Fifth*, was *Simoniacally chosen Pope*. For, that he might be chosen, he did under his hand promise to *Cardinal d' Este*, who had a great interest in the *Conclave*, that in the time of his *Popedom*, he would never create *Jerome Matthew*, the *Cardinal's* great Enemy, a *Cardinal*: Upon which promise he was through his interest chosen *Pope*. But, when afterwards the *Pope* violated his *Faith* to him, by creating his Enemy *Cardinal*; *d' Este*, being highly incensed against him for it, sent the very Instrument subscribed by the *Pope's* own hand, to *Philip the Second King of Spain*, who in the Year 1589, sent the *Duke of Suisse* extraordinary *Embassadour* to *Rome*, to intimate to *Sixtus the Fifth*, his intention of calling a *General Council*, according to the *Bull of* Julius *the Second*, for declaring this *Simoniacal Election*. When this Message was delivered to the *Pope*, and he saw the Instrument was discovered under his own hand, he fell into such a perplexity, that he died soon after, which stopt the progress of the *Business*. By this it evidently appears, that *Sixtus* himself was no lawful *Pope*, and therefore could create no *Cardinals*: And, because the *Cardinals* created by him, had a voice in the Election of the subsequent *Popes*; it follows, That

V. Supplicat. ad Imperat. Reg. Princip. super causis generalis Concilii convocandi contra Paulum 5. Lond. 1613.

there hath been no legal *Pope* ſince *Sixtus the fifth*. For, after the death of *Sixtus*, *Cardinal Montalto* his *Nephew*, with *forty Votes* entred the *Conclave*, and choſe *Urban the Seventh*, who lived but few days; after him *Gregory the Fourteenth*, who was *Pope* but ten Months: After him *Innocentius the Ninth*, who continued but two Months; after him *Clement the Eighth*, who out-lived the Election *thirteen Years*. But not to enquire any further into the irregular Election, and the *Simoniacal Bargains* of *Paul the Fifth*, after the death of *Clement*; this certainly may ſuffice to let Men ſee, what becomes of their *Faith*, when they pin it upon the *Pope's Sleeve*: For, if we are to rely upon his infallible Teſtimony, and he ſo far from being *Infallible*, that by their own *Conſtitutions* he was no *Pope*, nor to be looked on as other than a *Magician*, *Heathen*, and *Heretick*, is not our Faith then ſettled on a ſure *Foundation?* For what aſſurance can any one have, that amidſt all the Enormities, and ſecret *Practices* of the *Conclave*, any one is freely and legally choſen? But, Where will his *Faith* ſtand, when it is notorious, that a *Cardinal* muſt ſay, *Dabo tibi claves*, and that not without a *Contract* too? But, ſuppoſe all the aſſurance that may be of the Perſon who is to deliver this *Infallible Teſtimony*; yet at the utmoſt, the moſt Men in the World can have no more than a *Moral Certainty* of the *Definition it ſelf*. If we can imagine, that any one ſhould know that great Myſtery, when the *Pope ſhould define ex Cathedrâ*; yet, can he have any greater evidence of ſuch a Definition, than we have concerning the things revealed in Scripture? I cannot think that you will ſuppoſe any greater evidence of it, than if one *ſees and hears it*; and, what do we deſire leſs in reference to the *Doctrine of Chriſt?* But how few in the World are there, who ſtand by, when the *Pope* defines? May others be certain of ſuch a *Definition* or no, ſo as to be obliged to believe it? If not, What good can this *Infallibility* do them? If they may, Why do you quarrel with our way as *uncertain?* When if you grant your *Infallibility*, you cannot preſcribe any more *certain way*, but one much more liable to queſtion and diſpute than ours is: Thus you ſee what little advantage you get by all theſe *Bravado's* about *Infallibility*; and that you are ſo far from giving a ſatisfactory *account of Faith*, that you expoſe *Chriſtian Religion* to more *doubts*, *ſcruples*, and *uncertainties*, than ever before. Which may abundantly ſhew to all unprejudiced Minds, the great *unreaſonableneſs* of your way of reſolving Faith, which was the thing to be proved.

§. 11. 2. But, ſuppoſe your way to be never ſo *reaſonable*, yet *if it effect not that it was brought for*, it deſerves little favour from inquiſitive Perſons, and that I now come to evince, *viz. That ſuppoſing your Church Infallible, and that Infallibility proved by the Motives of Credibility, you do not eſcape the Circle objected againſt your way.* And really, whoſoever conſiders your way of management of things, will find, that though you give out *great words*, and pretend to prove the *Churches Infallibility*, *as* Moſes *and Chriſt's was proved*; yet your eye was all the while on nothing but the *Circle*, and thought, if you could get rid of that, you ſhould do well enough with any thing elſe. For, as though this *Circle* had ridden you like an *Ephialtes*, you *tumble*, and *groan*, and *toſs* this way and that, and when you think your ſelf free from it, it ſits as cloſe upon you as ever. When you come ſo miſerably off with the Proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*, you ſatisfie your ſelf with this; *'Tis ſufficient for the preſent to have declared how the Catholicks fall not into a Circle, as his Lordſhip here pretends they do.* Though this could not be ſufficient for your deſign, who had promiſed in the Page foregoing, to prove at large the *Infallibility* of the *Church*; yet you had done ſomewhat, if you had done this, which, if I much miſtake not, you are as much to ſeek in,

as

as in the Proofs of your *Churches Infallibility*. And that I prove by three things, from the *nature of that Faith* whose Resolution you promise, from *the Persons you prove it to*, from the *nature* of that *Infallibility* which you attempt to prove.

1. From the *nature of that Faith* you are enquiring a resolution for, which is not that which you call a *Humane Faith*, but a *Divine Faith*. When you go about to prove the *Churches Infallibility*, by the *Motives of Credibility*, is it a *Divine Faith* or no, which may be built on these *Motives?* Chuse which part you please. If it be, then by your own Confession, a *Divine Faith* may be built on *Prudential Motives*; if it be not, then what is all this to the purpose? For the Question is not, Whether by any other *kind of Assent* you cannot avoid the *circle*; but, Whether in the resolution of *Divine Faith* you can or no? For, I hope, you deny not, but the *Scriptures* and the *Churches Infallibility* are both to be believed with the *same kind of Assent*, built upon an *Infallible Testimony*; in this case I then ask, *Why, with a Divine Faith, you believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God?* You answer, *Because the Church, which is Infallible, delivers them so to us.* If I then ask, *Why with a Divine Faith you believe the Churches Infallibility?* Answer me if you can, any other way, than *because the Scriptures, which are infallible, say so.* And thus you see, it is only your running away from the *Question*, makes you think your self out of the *Circle*, and not any satisfactory Answer to it. Will you, or dare you say, that is an *Assent* of the same *nature*, which is built on the *Motives of Credibility*, with that which is grounded on an *Infallible Testimony?* If it be not, bethink your self of a new Answer: If it be, bethink your self of a new *Way* to oppose us, and not to think it sufficient to charge us with building *Divine Faith* on *Prudential Motives*, when you do it your self. But, if you should assert that to be a *Divine Faith*, which is built on the *Motives* of *Credibility*, you not only contradict your self, but the great Ones of your own Party. For your *Becanus* saith, *That these Motives are the Foundation only of a prudent Assent, but not Infallible*; and *Valentia* goes much higher, and tells us, *The Faith grounded on these Motives is not Divine, or infused, but acquisite, that it is in its nature uncertain and fallible, that it cannot be the Foundation of Christian Faith.* If this be true, To what end do you go about to resolve Faith upon such *Uncertainties*, in hopes to escape the *Circle* you see others in? This you see, how insufficient your Attempt is, because you speak not of the same *kind of Assent*, as to the *Scripture*, and the *Church*.

Becan. sum. p. 2. Tom. patr. de fide c. 1. q. 2. Sect. 8.

Valent. Tom. 1. disp. 1. q. 1. punct. 1. Sect. 8. Colum. 35.

2 You avoid not the *Circle* by the *different considerations of the Persons* you offer to prove the *Infallibility of the Church* and *Scripture* to. You tell us, *That when you prove the Infallibility of the Church by Scripture, you make use only of Arguments* ad hominem, *and argue* ex principiis concessis *against Sectaries; who deny the Infallibility of your Church, but admit the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, and therefore you may justly use Scripture-arguments against them.* I grant it: But still I say, you avoid not the *Circle* by this *Subterfuge* neither. For, 1. The question is not, Which way you will prove the *Infallibility of the Church* against those who deny it; but which way you resolve your *own Faith* of the *Churches* Infallibility? Therefore this signifies nothing at all as to your *Question* about the *Resolution* of *Faith*; for I suppose you build not *that* on any thing which your Adversary *grants* or *denies*. Is there no difference between the way of proving a thing to an Adversary, and the resolving *one's own Faith?* I question not, but you may dispute with him upon *Principles* he grants and you deny; but, I should think you no wise Man to build *your Faith* upon such *Principles*. So that this Eva-

P. 55. n. 1.

ſion comes not near the buſineſs. 2. Even in diſputing againſt your *Adverſaries* you cannot avoid the *Circle*, which I thus prove. You offer to prove to them the *Church* to be *Infallible* out of *Scripture*; for this you bring them particular places, and think preſently to vanquiſh them with, *Super hanc Petram*, *Paſce oves*, *& Dabo tibi claves*; but hence ariſeth another Queſtion, How you come infallibly to know, that this is *the ſenſe* of thoſe places? You know, your *Adverſaries* preſently deny any ſuch as *Infallibility* to be proved out of them. And, what way have you to aſſure them, this is the *ſenſe* of them, but becauſe your *Church*, which is *Infallible*, delivers this to be the ſenſe of them? And is not this then a plain *Circle? You are to believe the Church infallible, becauſe the Scripture ſaith ſo; and you are to believe the Scripture ſaith ſo, becauſe the Church is Infallible.* If this be not ſtill a plain *Circle*, you may queſtion whether there be any ſuch Figure in *Mathematicks*.

3. I prove you cannot avoid the *Circle* from your own Confeſſion of the *nature of that Infallibility, which you ſay is in the Church.* For you tell us,
P. 58. n. 4. *That the Churches Teſtimony doth not ſuppoſe any new Revelation from God, but only a ſupernatural Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, preſerving her from all Error in defining the Points of Chriſtian Faith.* By this Aſſertion, you deſtroy all poſſibility of avoiding the *Circle by the Motives of Credibility*; for if theſe had proved an *immediate Divine Revelation in the Church*, I confeſs you had proved the *Churches Infallibility* independently on *Scripture*; but, when you offer to prove only a *Divine Aſſiſtance* with the *Church*, in delivering former *Revelations*, you cannot, and the reaſon is, becauſe you can bring no ground at all why ſuch an *Aſſiſtance* ſhould be neceſſary in the *Church*; or why it ſhould be expected but from the *Promiſes made in Scripture* concerning ſuch an *Aſſiſtance of God's Spirit* to be with the *Church:* And therefore the utmoſt your *Motives of Credibility* can pretend to, is only to notifie that *Church* from others, which you ſuppoſe *Infallible:* But ſtill the *formal Reaſon* of your believing this *Infallibility*, cannot be from thoſe *Motives*, but upon thoſe *Promiſes* which you ſuppoſe to import ſuch an *Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt* with the *Church*, which ſhall ſecure her from Error: So that ſtill the *Circle* returns upon you: For, *you believe the Scriptures Infallible, becauſe of the Churches Teſtimony; and you believe the Church Infallible, becauſe of the Promiſes in Scripture concerning the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt with the Church, ſo as to ſecure her from all Error.* And thus, I hope, I have made good this *general Attempt* upon your *way of reſolving Faith*, by manifeſting the great *unreaſonableneſs*, and manifeſt *inſufficiency* of it.

§. 12. I now come to handle the particulars of this Chapter, which conſiſts of two things, *Proofs* and *Evaſions*, the *Proofs* you produce for your *Churches Infallibility*, and your *Evaſions* as to thoſe *Arguments* which are objected by his Lordſhip. Both of theſe will deſerve our *Conſideration*; and if it appear, that your *Proofs* are *weak*, and your *Evaſions ſilly*, you will have no great cauſe to triumph in this *Attempt* of yours. As to your *Proofs*, two things are conſiderable, *your Method of proving*, and the *Proofs*
P. 55. n. 1. *themſelves.* I begin with the *firſt*, which you deliver in theſe words. *Wherefore, as to the laſt demand (in which only there is difficulty)* viz. *How we know the Church to be Infallibly governed by the Holy Ghoſt; we anſwer, that we prove it firſt in general, not by the Scripture, but by the Motives of Credibility, which belong to the Church, in the ſame manner as the Infallibility of* Moſes, *and other Prophets, of Chriſt and his Apoſtles was proved, which was by the Miracles they wrought, and by other Signs of an Infallible Spirit, Direction, and Guidance from God, which appeared in them. Whence it is clear, that we incur*

cur no Circle. That, *supposing all that true* which you said before, yet thereby you avoid not the *Circle*, I shall take it for granted, I have already proved, till you better inform me: Our Business now therefore is, to consider, which *way* you prove this *Infallibility* of your *Church*, which you tell us, *is not by Scripture* (for which I commend your Ingenuity) but by the *Motives of Credibility*. But, lest any should think this a weak way of Probation, you tell us, *It is in the same manner that the Infallibility of all Persons divinely inspired was proved*, not excepting *Christ himself*. A most heroical and generous Attempt! For which the *Church* of *Rome* is infinitely obliged to you, if you make it good: For then it necessarily follows, that there is as great danger in not believing the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, as in not believing *Moses* and the *Prophets*, *Christ* and his *Apostles*. For, where there is an *equal Obligation* to believe, there is an *equal Sin* in not believing; and where the Sin is equal, it stands to reason that the *Punishment* should be so too. I suppose you deny not, but, Where there are *equal Motives* inducing to believe, there results an *equal Obligation* to Faith, because the *Grounds* obliging to assent, can be no other than the *Motives inducing* to it; and if these *Motives* be as strong and evident for your *Churches Infallibility*, as for that of *Moses* and *Christ*, Men must be as much obliged now to believe your *Church Infallible*, as, that *Moses and Christ were so*. So that the denial of your *Churches Infallibility*, most needs be accounted by you to be as high a piece of *Infidelity*, as if one should call in question the *Infallibility* of *Christ* himself, for you assert, That you have the same *Proofs* for the Infallibility of your *Church*, which there were to prove him Infallible. I do not therefore wonder at your Sharpness and Severity in your Censures of all out of your *Church*, when upon your Principles, the denying your *Churches Infallibility*, must needs be an offence of as high a nature, as if one denied the *Infallibility* of the *Sacred Scriptures*. But, lest you should not think these any *Absurdities* at all, we must come yet closer to the examination of your *Proofs*: For which we must enquire into these two things. 1. Whether *the same Motives of Credibility belong to your Church, by which* Moses *and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, shewed their Testimony to be Infallible.* 2. Whether, on supposition you had the same *Motives*, there were the same reason to believe the Testimony of your *Church Infallible*, as there was to believe them to be so.

1. Whether *the same Motives of Credibility belong to your Church or no.* And here again, these things offer themselves to consideration. 1. By what means their *Testimony* was proved *Infallible*. 2. Whether your *Churches Testimony* can be proved by the *same Motives* or no. For the *first*, you are pleased to give us this account, *Why* Moses *was accounted Infallible; for the* Israelites *seeing* Moses *to be a Person very devout, mild, charitable, and chaste, and endowed with the gift of working Miracles, were upon that ground obliged to receive him for a true Prophet; and to believe him Infallible, by acknowledging as true and certain, whatever he proposed to them from God.* All which I acknowledge to be very true; but am much to seek, how you will apply it to the proving your *Churches Infallibility*. What kind of *Miracles* those are which your *Church* pretends to, will be examined afterwards; the other *Motives of Credibility* mentioned, are *Devotion, Mildness, Charity*, and *Chastity*; and these, I suppose, you look on as those *Motives*, which must induce Men to believe the *Infallibility of your Church*. But, do you really think, that every Person who is *devout, mild, charitable*, and *chaste*, is therefore *Infallible?* If not, to what purpose do you produce them here? If you do, some out of *your Church* may be as *Infallible* as those in it. P. 56. n. 2.

it. Especially, if your *Superstitious Ceremonies* be the greatest part of your *Devotion*; and your *burning of Hereticks*, the Argument of your *Mildness*; and your *Damning all out of your Church*, be the best evidence of your *Charity*; and the *Lives of your Popes*, the most *pregnant Instances* of your *Churches Chastity*. The rest of your Discourse, wherein you endeavour after your way, to *prove that there were sufficient Motives of Credibility, to believe the Testimony of Christ and his Apostles*, I suppose no Christian will deny; and *that the Miracles wrought by them, were Proofs that their Testimony was Infallible*, I am so far from questioning, that all your other *Motives* signifie nothing without them. Which, because it hath so great an influence on the present Dispute, I think it necessary to be a little further cleared, than it is by you, and chiefly for this *end*, to let you see, *how much you have befooled your self in attempting to prove the Infallibility of your Church, in the same manner that Christ and his Apostles Infallibility was proved in*, and yet insisting on that of *Miracles*, as the great evidence of their *Infallibility*, which your *Church* cannot with any face pretend to. I acknowledge it then as a great *Truth*, that it was necessary, that the *Testimony* of all such who pretend to be *Infallible*, must be confirmed by such *Miracles* as *Christ* and his *Apostles* wrought; nay, that it is impossible, without such *Evidence*, to prove any Testimony infallible, where that *Infallibility* is pretended to, *independently upon Scripture*, as it is in your present case. Which will be thus made evident: *Absolute Infallibility* is not consistent with the *shortness* of the *humane Understanding*, for such an *Infallibility* must suppose an *Infinity* of *Knowledge*; for, where there is a *defect* in the *Apprehension*, there is a *possibility* of *deception*; therefore only an *Infinite Being* can be *absolutely Infallible*. Now, Man's *Understanding* being so *finite*, and limited in its Conceptions, it is on that account apt to be imposed upon, and to form *false Notions* of things; so that supposing no Being in the World of greater *Perfections* than *Man* is, there never could be any such thing as *Infallibility* among Men. For, though some Men's *Understandings* might *outstrip* others in the quickness of Conception, and solidity of Judgment; yet the *Nature* of *Man* being thus *finite*, that presumption would lie against all pretence of Infallibility. It being then impossible, that Man's Understanding should be *in it self Infallible*, we must consider, whether there be a *possibility* it should receive any *Infallibility* from that *Infinite Being*, which is above it. This then must be taken for granted, that as an *Infinite Understanding* cannot be *deceived*, so *Infinite Goodness* cannot *deceive*. And therefore, whatever doth immediately proceed from a *Being infinitely Wise and Good*, cannot but be *infallibly true*. And there is no repugnancy at all in the nature of the thing, but that this *Infinite Being* may, in a way certain, but imperceptible by us, communicate to the *Minds* of *Men* such *Notions* of things, which are the effects of his own *Wisdom* and *Counsel*: And this is that we call *Divine Inspiration*. But then we are still to consider, That the understanding of a *finite Creature*, cannot be any further *Infallible*, than as it receives those *Notions* which are imprinted upon it by the *Infinite* and *Supreme Intellect* of the World; and such a Person is no further *Infallible* in what he speaks, than as he delivers to the World those *very Conceptions*, which are thus formed in his Mind. And this is that which the *Apostle* means when he says, That *Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. And so far as they were thus moved, so far they were Infallible, and no further. But this *Infallibility* being not intended meerly for the satisfaction of the *Mind* of *him* that hath it, but for the general *Good* of the *World*, it is necessary that there be some way whereby Men may come to understand who

2 Pet. 1. 21.

are

are *Infallibly assisted*, and who not. For otherwise the World would be more exposed to *Delusions* under this *Pretext* of *Infallibility*; than if there were never any such thing in the World. Either therefore every Man must be *infallibly assured* in his *Mind*, that such a Person is infallible in what he is to deliver, which is a needless piece of *Enthusiasm*; or else such *external Evidences* of it are to be used, which may induce all rational and considerative Persons to the belief of it. Which is the way that *God* in his *infinite Wisdom* hath made choice of; by making those very Persons, whose Understandings are thus assisted by him, to be the *Instruments* of *doing some things above the power of Nature.* And nothing can be more reasonable, than to believe their Testimony *true*, who are imployed as such immediate *Instruments* of *Divine Power*; and if their Testimony be believed true, their *Doctrine* must be *Infallible*; for the greatest part of their *Testimony* is, That they deliver not their *Doctrines* from *themselves*, but immediately from *God.* And consequently their *Testimony* must be owned as *Infallible*, in whatever they deliver as from *God*; it being very unreasonable to think, that *God* would favour such Persons with so extraordinary a *Power*, who should falsifie their Message, and deceive the World. Thus you see, that whatever *Motives of Credibility* you would blind the World with, there can be no *Motive* independent on *Scripture*, which is sufficient to prove *Infallibility*, but such a power of *working Miracles, which* Moses, *and the Prophets, and Christ, and his Apostles had*, which last, as you truly say, *received their Commission from Christ to Preach every where, and to confirm their words with Signs that followed; by which Signs, all their Hearers were bound to submit themselves unto them, and to acknowledge their words for infallible Oracles of Truth.* P. 56. n. 2.

§. 13. Now, What reasonable Man could otherwise expect, but that after you had so solemnly promised *to prove the Infallibility of your Church, in the very same manner that* Moses, *with other Prophets, Christ and his Apostles were first proved to be Infallible*, which are twice your words; and your at large shewing, *That the main ground why they were believed Infallible, was, because of the Miracles wrought by them, whence they needed not the Testimony of Scripture:* You should have shewed us what kind of parallel *Miracles* are wrought in your *Church*, to prove its *Infallibility.* But, instead of that, when you come to the purpose, you shuffle us off, in a most ridiculous and impertinent manner: For, you tell us, That *as therefore* Moses, *our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, were proved Infallible by their Works, Signs, and Miracles, without Scripture; so is the Church without help of the same sufficiently proved to be Infallible by the Motives of Credibility.* Well, but *what*, and *where* are these *Motives of Credibility?* Are they of the same kind and nature with the *Signs* and *Miracles* wrought by them or not? If not, How can the way and manner be the same, which you promised to prove the *Churches Infallibility?* If not, What assurance can you give us, that those will prove Infallibility, as well as their *Works and Miracles?* This should have been demonstrated, and those *Motives* produced to the view of the World, if you had designed any other than *jugling* with your Readers. Instead of this, you tell us, That *Hereticks, though they have the Scripture, yet being out of the true Church, they do wholly want these Signs of Infallibility: Of which, see* Bellarmine, *and other Catholick Authors discoursing more at large,* de notis Ecclesiæ. *'Tis sufficient for the present, to have declared how Catholicks fall not into a Circle, as his Lordship pretends they do.* These are excellent ways of proof, and fit only for a Church that pretends to be Infallible, and then most of all, when her Infallibility was to be proved. P. 55. n. 1. P. 56. n. 2. P. 57.

What

What did you lead us this long dance for, if you never intended to prove your *Church Infallible?* Could you not have referred us to *Bellarmine* at first, as well as at last? Nay, and now you do turn us off to him, you bid us, go seek the *Notes of the Church*, and not the *Proofs of Infallibility*; which, sure, are different things, unless you suppose no *Church true*, but what is *Infallible*. But however, you are sure not to miss the *Hereticks*, they must have a blow at parting, *They are out of the Church, and do wholly want these Signs of Infallibility.* What *Signs of Infallibility?* Speak out, and tell us, *what they are*, and *where they lie*, and *how they may be known?* For otherwise we may mistake in the *Physiognomy* of your *Church*, and instead of *Signs* of *Infallibility*, we may see shrewd *signs* of *Imposture* and *Delusion* in her. And it is the more suspicious, because you are so afraid of producing them after so solemn a promise to do it. However, you tell us, *'Tis sufficient for the present to have declared how Catholicks fall not into a Circle:* Well, I see, though we miss of the *Coals St.* Laurence *was broiled on*, we shall have a *Feather from the Wing of a Seraphim*; though you fail of your promise, we shall have something as good; and as great a feat of activity as that had been, *viz.* to let us see, *How the Papists dance in a Round, and yet make no Circle.* Your Demonstrations are so good in this kind, it is pity you do not imploy your excellent Wit in squaring *Mathematical Circles*, as well as *this*; and I shall as soon hope to see you perform the one as the other. But, can you, without smiling at our simplicity, tell us, (after such a wide-mouthed promise, as you made in the
P. 56. n. 2. Page foregoing; *But, because we have often promised to prove the Infallibility of the Church, it will be necessary to insist somewhat longer upon this Point, and declare the matter at large*) *That it is enough to vindicate your selves from the Circle?* Was this the thing you promised, or the proofs of your *Churches Infallibility?* I confess *Quid ferat hic tanto dignum promissor hiatu?* came into my mind at first reading those words, and it proves accordingly. You really meant no such thing as proving your *Church Infallible:* And you are very excusable in it, though you had promised it; for no *Promise can bind to Impossibilities.* But it may be yet, though these *Proofs* do not come after the Promise, they may have gone before it; for I find before a large *Catalogue* mentioned of such *Signs and Motives*, which may prove the *Churches Infallibility*, as *Sanctity of Life, Miracles, Efficacy, Purity and Excellency of Doctrine, fulfilling of Prophecies, Succession of lawfully sent Pastors, Unity, Antiquity, and the very name of Catholick*, &c.
P. 55. n. 1. Number enough, if that would do it. But we shall see what force these *Motives* are of by these following Queries.

1. Is it all one with you, *To know a Church to be true, and to make it Infallible?* These you call the *Motives of Credibility* for your *Churches Infallibility*, were wont to be esteemed only the *Notes of Distinction* of the True *Church* from all others. The Question, I suppose, concerning *these*, had this rise. There being, after the Reformation, several distinct Societies of Men, pretending to be the True *Christian Church*, to which every *Christian* ought to associate himself; there was a necessity of pitching on some way, whereby the True *Christian Church* might be distinguished from other Communions; which begat a new Controversie, What were the proper *Notes* of this Society. Those of your Party, as *Bellarmine* tells you, differed much in the number of them: Some of which are those by you mentioned; but whether they be the True *Notes* of the *Church* or no, which hath been largely examined by others. What are these to the proof of *Infallibility*, setting aside that of *Miracles?* Is it not possible that there should be a

Society

Society of Men joyning together in the Profeſſion of *Chriſtian Religion*, but theſe Men muſt preſently be *infallible* in whatever they deliver as the Senſe of their Society? Their viſible Profeſſion of *Chriſtian Religion*, makes them a *True Church*: but cannot Men ſeem to profeſs our Religion, unleſs they have a viſible *Infallible Head* to guide them? Is *Infallibility* the *Soul* of a *Church*, which gives it its Being, I mean, a *preſent Infallibility* continually actuating and informing the *Body* of it? Cannot a Man be known to be a *True Man*, unleſs he be *inſpired?* Nor a *Church* diſtinguiſhed from other *Societies*, but by a *Spirit* of *Infallibility*? The truth is, Let *Bellarmine* multiply his *fifteen Notes of the Church* to *fifteen hundred*, if he pleaſe; nay, let it pretend to what *Infallibility* it pleaſe: if any Society of Men challenging the name of *Church* to it ſelf, do deſtroy the *end* of its *Conſtitution*, or hold any thing directly contrary to the *Foundation* of its *Inſtitution*; all other *Notes* in the world can never make it a *True Church*. So that the only certain *Note* of a True *Church*, is its *Agreement* with the primary *Foundation* of it in that *Doctrine* which was *Infallible*, and atteſted by *Miracles* undoubtedly Divine: That which holds the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, is the *Chriſtian Church*; and the nearer any *Society* comes to *that*, the *purer* it is; the more it is diſtant from it, the more *impure*: and no Man who honours the *Chriſtian Religion*, can be bound to communicate with the *Impurities* of ſuch a *Church*, let it bear it never ſo high under the pretence of *infallibility*. If you boaſt never ſo much of your *Unity*, *Succeſſion*, *Antiquity*, the *name of Catholick*, &c. if your *Doctrine* be *repugnant* to what was originally delivered by the Founder of the *Chriſtian Church*; your Society is not the True *Chriſtian Church*. But, ſuppoſe it were, and that it were known ſo to be by ſuch *Notes* as theſe are; Can you not conceive a *Church* ſhould be conſonant to the Doctrine of *Chriſt*, but it muſt be it ſelf *infallible* in *deciding Controverſies?* Cannot you imagine a *Society* conſiſting of all True *Chriſtians* in the world, ſhould be made up of ſuch perſons who all firmly believe that *Doctrine infallible* which *Chriſt* delivered, but yet judge themſelves all fallible, and dare not uſurp that *royal prerogative* of *Heaven*, in preſcribing *infallibly* in matters queſtioned, but leave all to judge according to the *Pandects* of the *Divine Laws*, becauſe each member of this *Society* is bound to take care of his ſoul, and of all things that tend thereto? Is ſuch an *Idea* of a *Chriſtian Church*, a thing unreaſonable, inconſiſtent, or contrary to any *Law* of its Foundation; or rather, is it not a very true and juſt repreſentation of that *Society* of Men, which our *bleſſed Saviour* inſtituted as a *Church* in the world?

2. Do you mean, *That theſe Motives ſhould prove the Chriſtian Church at large infallible, or your preſent particular univerſal Church of* Rome? For ſome of your *Motives* ſeem to reſpect the *one*, and the reſt the *other*, Notion of it. When you mention *miracles*, *efficacy*, *purity and excellency of Doctrine*, *fulfilling of Prophecies*, do you really intend theſe for the proof of your *preſent Roman-Churches Infallibility*, as that is diſtinct from all other *Churches* of *Chriſtians* in the world? If you do (as you muſt, if you ſpeak to the purpoſe) ſhew us what *miracles*, *efficacy*, *purity and excellency of Doctrine* there are in your *Church* beyond and beſide all other *Churches* in the world, What *fulfilling of Prophecies* among you, which makes your *Church infallible?* Is it the *Prophecy*, That *your Church ſhall be infallible* that is fulfilled? Shew then to us where *that Prophecy* is, and how it appears to be *fulfilled?* Is it becauſe *your Church pretends to be infallible?* I do heartily acknowledge, *ſome Prophecies are therein fulfilled*, but ſuch as your *Church* hath little ground to be proud of their accompliſhment. But, to all im- §. 14.

partial *Chriſtians*, the accompliſhment of *thoſe Prophecies*, which ſpeak of the *degenerate ſtate of the Church*, as they are a great Confirmation of the *Infallibility* of the *Divine Revealer* of them, when they ſee it ſo remarkably in the *ſignatures of your Church*; ſo they are far from being any *motive of credibility* to them to prove your *Church to be Infallible*. Unleſs it be meant that the *ſtate of your Church is an infallible evidence that thoſe Prophecies are fulfilled*. But I pray, why ſhould *fulfilling of Prophecies*, make your *Church Infallible?* I had rather thought, if you could have proved *your Church to have been Prophetical*, it had been more to your purpoſe. And if your *Popes in Cathedrâ* had foretold *future events*, which by their coming to paſs, had evidenced to the world they had a *true ſpirit of Prophecy*, then indeed you had ſaid ſomething towards *Infallibility*. But that the *meer fulfilling of Prophecies*, owned Divine by all *Chriſtians*, ſhould prove *your Church Infallible*, is ſuch *a motive of Credibility* concerning that *Infallibility*, that it proves nothing, but by this conſequence, *If Chriſt were Infallible, then your Church is*. Or do you mean, *becauſe ſome Prophecies concerning your Church are fulfilled, therefore your Church is infallible*; by the ſame reaſon I hope you will not deny, but *that Antichriſt is Infallible*, for when ever he did, doth, or ſhall appear, no doubt there will be *fulfilling of Prophecies*, and thoſe very clear ones too. And therefore *Antichriſt* and *your Pope* may go together for *Infallibility*.

But it may be yet you have ſome *other motives* beſides *fulfilling Prophecies*, and thoſe are *miracles*; now you ſpeak indeed to the purpoſe. But yet ſtill we poor Infidels (*becauſe out of your Church*) deſire a little ſatisfaction concerning them too. 1. We very reaſonably deſire, *That he in your Church who pretends moſt to infallibility, ſhould do theſe miracles himſelf.* For that was always the *way* in *Scripture*, for them whoſe *teſtimony* was to be believed *Infallible*, to be the *workers* of thoſe *miracles* which ſhould induce Men to believe ſuch an *Infallibility*. Do you think the *Iſraelites* would have believed *Moſes Infallible*, if any ordinary *Iſraelite* had wrought thoſe *miracles* which he did? unleſs you would ſuppoſe that thoſe *miracles* were purpoſely wrought to have atteſted that *Moſes was Infallible*. But yet *God* thought it much more fit, that *Moſes himſelf* ſhould be the *inſtrument* of doing them, and ſo it was with our *Bleſſed Saviour*. Let then your *Church* produce the ſeveral *miracles* wrought by your *Popes* to atteſt their Infallibility; or, if you believe *Pope and Council* the ſubject of *Infallibility*, produce the *miracles* to prove that. *God* was always ſo juſt and reaſonable, as not to expect the belief of any *Infallibility* without ſuch evidences given for it as might perſwade Men to believe it: and you acknowledge, *That independently on Scripture there can be no ſuch proof of Infallibility as Miracles*, and you require it from us to believe the *preſent Church Infallible*, where then are your *preſent miracles* wrought to atteſt this Infallibility? For as long as you require ſuch an aſſent to the *preſent Churches Infallibility*, it is neceſſary on your own grounds, that the *preſent Church* ſhould always work *miracles* in order to the proving this *Infallibility*.

2. We deſire *ſuch miracles as may ſufficiently convince the Infidels as to this point of your Infallibility*. For that was always the *way* uſed in *Scripture*; The intention of *miracles* was to perſwade thoſe who did not believe. Would *Pharaoh*, or the *Ægyptians* have believed *Moſes*, if all his *miracles had been wrought in a corner*, where none but *Iſraelites* had been preſent? Would the *Jews* have believed *in Chriſt*, if he had not come in publick among them, and wrought ſuch frequent, publick and uncontrouled miracles, that his greateſt *enemies* durſt not deny them? If you would

would then have us believe your *present Churches Infallibility*, let your *Pope*, or at least your *Priests* come and do such kind of *Miracles* among us which may bear the examination of inquisitive Men, and then try whether we will not believe your *Infallibility*; but till then, excuse us. Think not we are of such easie Faith, that the pretended growing out of a *Leg* in *Spain*, or any of your famous *Miracles* wrought by your *Priests* in *Italy*, will perswade us to believe your *Church Infallible*. It is always observed, your *Miracles* are most talked on, where People are most *ignorant*, and therefore most apt to be deceived. Your *Priests*, like the *Devils* in the *Primitive Times*, can do no *feats* when their *opposers* are by; it is an easie thing for a *Stump* to grow a *Leg* in its passage from *Spain* hither; for *Fama crescit eundo*; such things are most believed where *Circumstances* are least capable of examination. And the *Juglings* and Impostures of your *Priests* have been so notorious in this kind, that their *Pretences* to *Miracles* have made more *Infidels* than *Catholicks*, by making Men more apt to question, whether ever there were any *real Miracles* done, than believe the *truth* of yours. Very likely then it is, that you should perswade the World your *Church is Infallible*, because of the *Miracles* wrought in it.

3. What discrimination do you put between those *lying wonders* which you are foretold shall be wrought at the *coming of Antichrist*, and those *pretended Miracles* which are wrought among you? Convince us by sufficient evidence, that the things which seem most confirmed by your *Miracles*, viz. *Invocation of Saints*, is a thing consonant to the Doctrine established by the undoubted *Miracles* of *Christ* and his *Apostles?* If it be contrary to it, either you must prove that *Doctrine* false; or, if you admit it true, you prove your *Miracles* to be *false*; because contrary to a *Doctrine* established by *Miracles* undoubtedly Divine. And God can never be supposed to attest with *Miracles* the Truth of *Doctrines* contrary to each other. And thence the wisest of your *Church* are so far from insisting on this of *Miracles* for a *Motive of Credibility* concerning your *Churches Infallibility*, that they leave it out from being a *Note* of the *Church*; because *Hereticks*, as they say, may as to all outward appearance work as great *Miracles* as the best *Catholicks*. And therefore *Bellarmine* saith, *No Man can have an absolute certainty concerning the truth of Miracles, because the Devil, though he cannot work true Miracles, can work, as to appearance, the greatest.* Therefore since the confirmation of *Christian Religion* by *Miracles undoubtedly Divine*, there can be no relyance on the tryal of *Miracles* for the *truth* of any *Doctrine:* For those very *Miracles* and *Doctrine* must be judged according to that rule of Faith which was confirmed by Divine Miracles. Thus we have examined those *Motives* which seem most to prove Infallibility, and shewn how little they agree to the *present Churches Infallibility.* *De Notis Ecclesiæ, cap. 14.*

3. As to the *other Motives*, what evidence do you produce, *That wherever they are, the Church is Infallible*; and, that these do *infallibly belong to your Church?* For both these must be made evident, or you do nothing. Now these Motives are, *Sanctity of Life, Succession, Unity, Antiquity, and the very name of Catholick*, &c. How hard is it to conceive the Connexion between these and *Infallibility!* Nay, they are so far from it, that it hath been abundantly proved against your Party, that these are no certain *Notes* of the *true Church* (which is a Controversie I shall not now discuss.) And if the *Church* cannot be proved to be *true* by them, much less certainly will it be proved to be *Infallible.* But suppose all this, is your *Church* so remarkable for *Sanctity of Life*, that it should be a *motive* for your *Infallibility?* Have your *Popes* been indeed such *Holy Men*, that we may not question §. 15.

but they were moved by the *Holy Ghoſt when they ſpake?* Certainly, you have ſome other way to know it than all *Hiſtories* both of *Friends* and *Enemies*, and the conſtant *Fame* of the World, which hath then much abuſed us with Stories quite of another nature. Or, is the *ſtate of your Church* ſo *pure and holy*, that it muſt ſhew it ſelf *Infallible* by that? But whom will you be judged by in this caſe? I deſire you not to ſtand to the *Verdict* of your *Adverſaries*. Will you believe Men of your *own Communion?* Pray read what ſad Complaints are made of the *degenerate State* of your *Church* by *Petrarch*, *Mantuan*, *Clemangis*, *Eſpencæus*, *Eraſmus*, *Caſſander*, and ſeveral others, and judge you whether we have not reaſon to cry up the *Sanctity of your Church*. *But theſe*, (it may be you will ſay) *were diſcontented Perſons*. Will you believe then your *Cardinals?* And if ever you will believe them, it ſhould certainly be, when they meet to adviſe concerning the *State* of your *Church*; and was not this the Expreſſion of the *Colledge* of *choſen Cardinals* for Reformation of the *Church*, under *Paul* 3. *Per nos, inquimus, per nos, nomen Chriſti blaſphematur apud gentes.* Is not this a great evidence of your *Sanctity?* If you will not believe the *Cardinals*, you will not certainly queſtion the judgment of him whom you would fain have to be *Infallible*, the *Pope* himſelf. And theſe are the words of *Adrian* 6. in his *Inſtructions* to his *Legate* at the Diet of *Norimberg*, *A. D.* 1522. *Scimus in hâc Sede aliquot jam annis multa abominanda fuiſſe, abuſus in Spiritualibus, exceſſus in mandatis, & omnia deniq; in perverſum mutata.* If ever *Pope* was *Infallible* he was in ſaying ſo, and he could not but be *in Cathedrâ* when he ſaid it. You ſee then what evidence you have from your ſelves concerning that *Sanctity of Life* which is in your *Church*. But it may be ſtill, you do not mean *real Sanctity*, but that the *Doctrine of your Church* tends more to promote it, than that of any *other Church*. I heartily wiſh, the quite contrary could not be too truly ſaid of it, and it is well known, that one of your great *Artifices* whereby you perſwade great Perſons to your *Religion*, is, the *liberty* it indulgeth them in *Sin* here, and yet the *hopes* it gives them of *Heaven* hereafter. Our Doctrine requires *indiſpenſable Obedience to all the Precepts of Chriſt*: Yours tell them, *thoſe which are the moſt ſtrict and ſevere, are not Precepts, but Counſels of Perfection*. Ours, *That there is no hope of Salvation without hearty amendment of Life*: Yours, *That Penance is requiſite and external ſatisfaction to the Church; and for Internals, that Contrition is very commendable, but if there be not that, Attrition will ſerve the turn*. Ours, *Charges Men to look to their Salvation in this Life, becauſe when Life is ended their Eſtate is irrecoverable*: Yours, *That though Men die in their Sins, yet they may be relieved by the Prayers of the Living, and that there is hope they may get through Purgatory to Heaven at laſt*. So that ſuppoſing any *Perſons* to own *Chriſtianity* to be *true*, it is hard to conceive there ſhould be more Artifices imagined to reconcile the *Love of the Pleaſures of Sin* here with the *hopes of Heaven* at laſt, than are uſed by thoſe of your Profeſſion. So that if I ſhould ſuppoſe my ſelf a *Heathen Philoſopher*, and any of your Profeſſion ſhould come and tell me, Theſe were the *Precepts*, and theſe the *Promiſes* of *Chriſtian Religion*, but I could believe none of them, but by the *Infallible Propoſition of your Church*, and that I was to know your *Church Infallible* by that *Sanctity of Life* which was in it; when I had throughly conſidered, not only the *Impieties* committed by the *great ones* of your *Religion*, even in *Rome* in the firſt place, but the *Artifices* uſed to enervate all the *Precepts* of *real Sanctity*, and ſo plainly to ſee what *Intereſt* and *Deſign* is carried on under all theſe *Diſguiſes*: I ſhould be inſuperably aſſaulted with the thoughts that

thoſe

those of your *Religion* who were the Authors of these things, were so far from believing your *Church Infallible*, that they really believed neither *Christian* nor any other *Religion* in the World. So much for that *Sanctity of Life* which is in your *Church*. As for your other Motives of *Unity, Succession, Antiquity, and the name of Catholick*, &c. they have so little affinity with any pretence of *Infallibility*, and do equally agree to those *Churches*, as the *Greek* and *Abyssine*, which you are so far from acknowledging Infallible, that you will not grant them to be *true Churches* (notwithstanding these *Motives*) that I cannot easily imagine to what *end* you produced them, unless to let us see, you had the gift of *saying something*, though *nothing* to the purpose.

When you have thus apparently failed in producing any *shadow* of *proof* for your *Churches Infallibility by these Motives of Credibility*, we now come to see how good you are at the *defensive part*, who have been so unhappy in your Attempts. Therefore we must consider what *Arts* you use in putting by the force of those *Arguments* which are produced against you by his *Lordship*. After he had urged that Question against you, *How it may appear that your Church is Infallibly governed by the Holy Ghost*, to which we have seen how impossible it is for you to give any satisfactory answer, he proceeds to another Argument, which lies in these words; *Besides, this is an inviolable ground of Reason, That the Principles of any Conclusion must be of more credit than the Conclusion it self. Therefore if the Articles of Faith, the Trinity, the Resurrection, and the Rest, be the Conclusions, and the Principles by which they are proved be only Ecclesiastical Tradition; it must needs follow, that the Tradition of the Church is more Infallible than the Articles of Faith, if the Faith which we have of the Articles should be finally resolved into the Veracity of the Churches Testimony.* To this your Answer is very considerable. 1. You tell us, *That the ground of all this Discourse is the Authority of* Aristotle *cited in the Margin, which you repeat after him.* But, I pray, Whence learn'd you that this was all the *ground* of his Discourse? For his *Lordship* doth not say, that *Aristotle* saith so, and therefore it is so; but says, *That it is an inviolable ground of Reason* (which words you prudently left out, that there might appear some Shadow for such a Cavil) and cites only the concurrent Testimony of *Aristotle* with that evidence of Reason which is in it. And will you deny this to be an undoubted Principle in Reason, that, *That which is assumed as the Ground and Reason why I assent to any thing, must be more certain and evident, than that is which I assent to on that Ground?* Certainly you must have an *Art* above all other Men to make the *Superstructure* stronger than the *Foundation*; the particular *Problems* in *Mathematicks*, more *evident* than the *Postulata*; the *conclusion*, surer than the *Premisses*. But you think to come off this Absurdity. 2. *By distinguishing between Science and Faith*, or, as you express it, *between the proceeding of the Understanding when it works naturally and necessarily, by and from the evidence and clearness of its Object: And when it works supernaturally, and produceth supernatural and free Acts, meerly, or at least principally from the Impulse and Inclination of the Will; for in such cases the Maxim holds not*, viz. *That the Principles of a Conclusion must be of more credit than the Conclusion it self. Now the Act of Believing is such an Act; that is, which the Understanding elicites, rather by a voluntary and free inclination and consent of the Will, than from any evident certainty in the Object whereto it assents.* A most judicious and profound Discourse! to which I know not whether ever I can perswade *my Will*, but I am sure, I never shall *my Understanding*. Lest you should think, it is only some *Impulse* of

§. 16.

P. 61. n. 3. *Aristot. 1. Post. c. 2. T. 16.*

P. 57.

my

my Will which hinders my *Aſſent*, I ſhall fairly lay down the Reaſons which keep me from it.

1. That all aſſent of the *Underſtanding* is grounded upon *Evidence.*

2. That however that *Evidence* proceeds, yet the *Foundation of Aſſent* muſt be more evident than the thing aſſented to. And theſe two I ſuppoſe will fully reach the Scope of your Anſwer, by ſhewing that your diſtinction *of Acts Natural and Supernatural, is both untrue and impertinent.*

1. *That all Aſſent is grounded upon Evidence, i. e.* that no Man can aſſent to any thing *meerly becauſe he will*, but there muſt be ſufficient reaſon inducing and perſwading to that *Aſſent.* You acknowledge *this be to true in Acts of Knowledge, but not of Faith* ; but, What do you make to be the *Genus* in your definition of *Faith?* I ſuppoſe you will ſay, it is *an Aſſent of the Mind.* If it be ſo, the Mind cannot be ſuppoſed to elicite an Act of the ſame nature in ſo repugnant a manner to it ſelf, that it ſhould aſſent to any thing without *evidence.* I know what Diſcourſes thoſe of your Party have, concerning the *obſcurity* which is neceſſary to *Faith.* If you mean *obſcurity* as to the *Object* believed, *i. e.* that the matters to be believed are not ſo *clear* to us as *demonſtrations*, I will not gainſay it : But if you mean *obſcurity*, or want of *evidence*, as to the *reaſon* inducing me to believe, I utterly deny any ſuch *obſcurity* to belong to *Faith*, or to be conſiſtent with it. For *God* doth not require us to believe any thing without *ſufficient grounds* for our believing it, and thoſe *grounds* do bear a proportionable evidence to the nature of that *aſſent* which he requires. If he requires an *Infallible Aſſent*, he gives *Infallible Grounds* ; if he requires a *firm* and *certain aſſent*, he gives *firm and certain grounds* ; if he requires only a *probable aſſent*, he gives only *probable evidence.* But ſtill, ſuch as the *nature* of the *aſſent* is, ſuch is the *evidence* he gives for it. To make this plainer by an Inſtance, *That Chriſt was the true Meſſias*, he requires an *aſſent* built upon *infallible grounds*, and therefore God gave ſuch *infallible evidence* of it by the *Miracles* which he wrought. That theſe *Miracles* were once really done, he requires our *firm Aſſent*, and therefore gives *certain evidence* by an Univerſal and uncontrouled tradition ; but whether St. *Paul*, or any other *Apoſtolical Perſon* were Author of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*, he requires only an *aſſent* built upon the moſt *probable grounds*, and therefore he hath given us no more for it. But ſtill as the *aſſent* is, ſo the *evidence* muſt be. For *Faith* being an act of the *mind*, whoſe nature is to judge according to *reaſon*, we cannot ſuppoſe any act of it to proceed in a *brutiſh manner* by a meer *impulſe* of the *will.* I deny not, but the *will* may be ſaid to have ſome kind of influence upon the underſtanding, both in furthering and hindering *aſſent :* But it is not by any command it hath over the *mind* in its *acts*, but as it can *divert* the mind from, or incline it to the ſearching into the *evidence* of the things. Therefore when we commonly ſay, *Facile credimus quæ volumus*, and ſo on the contrary ; it is not becauſe of the *will's immediate power* upon the Underſtanding, but, as the *deſire* of a thing makes us *inquiſitive* after it, ſo the diſlike of it makes us unwilling to hear the *reaſons* for it, and ready to entertain any pretence againſt it. Thus, I grant, the *will* may have *power* upon the *mind as to the eliciting the Act of Faith*, not that I can *aſſent* to a thing as *true*, becauſe I deſire it to be *true* ; but this *inclination* of the *will* removes thoſe *impediments* which would obſtruct my diſcovery of the evidence which is in it. You have certainly a *mind* of another *mould* than others have that can believe things which do not appear *credible* to you ; yet ſuch a kind of *Faith* as this, is very neceſſary for your *Churches Infallibility* ; and for that, your diſcourſe

of

of believing by the impulſe of the will, is very proper and ſeaſonable. But other perſons may think it an *Imperfection* in their minds, that they cannot believe any thing any further than it appears *credible*; that is, that they can *go* no further than they have *legs*; nor *ſee* when their *eyes* are ſhut, or the *room dark*. But it may be, you will tell me, *All this diſcourſe proceeds on ſuppoſition, that Faith were a natural act of the mind; but you ſpeak of a ſupernatural Faith.* It may be ſo; but, I hope, you ſpeak not of an *irrational Faith*, which muſt believe things beyond the *evidence* of their *Credibility*. *Faith*, whether *natural* or *ſupernatural*, *acquired* or *infuſed*, is ſtill an *act* of the *mind*; and let it have but what belongs to it as ſuch, and call it what you will. I deny not a peculiar *Operation* of *Grace*, in the eliciting the *Act* of *Divine Faith*; but ſtill I ſay, The manner whereby it is wrought, muſt be agreeable to the *nature* of the *Underſtanding*, and by diſcovering the *Credibility* which is in the *Objects of Faith*. If you ſay, The *Aſſent* is *infuſed*, I muſt ſay, The *Evidence* is firſt *infuſed*; for as *Chriſt*, when he healed the *blind*, did not make them ſee *Objects* which did not *appear viſible*; ſo neither doth the *Spirit of God* in planting *Faith* make Men diſcern *Objects* which do not appear *credible*; and the ſtronger the *Aſſent* is, the greater is the *Evidence* and *Credibility* of the Object. And can you call then that *any free inevident Aſſent*, which goes no further than the *Object* appears *credible?* It cannot be then any *Act of the Will*, but meerly of the *Mind*, which yields aſſent to any *Object* propounded as *credible* to it. So that in what way and manner *Aſſent* is required in that ſame manner doth *God* give proportionable evidence: I deny not but that *Aſſent* is required to Objects *inevident to ſenſe* and reaſon; but then I ſay, The *aſſent* is not required to what is *obſcure* and *inevident*; but to what is *evident* to us, and therefore *credible*. In the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, the manner of the *Hypoſtatical Union* is to us *inevident*, but then *God* doth not require our Aſſent to the *Manner*, but to the *Truth* of the thing it ſelf. Where-ever *God* requires us to believe any thing as *True*, he gives us *evidence* that it is ſo: where-ever it appears the thing is *inevident*, we may lawfully *ſuſpend* our *Aſſent*, and, for all that I know, it is our *duty* ſo to do.

But yet you have not done with this profound diſcourſe; *For you very learnedly diſtinguiſh a double proceeding in probations; the one is*, per principia intrinſeca, which you very well Engliſh *(by intrinſecal Principles)* i. e. *ſuch as have a neceſſary, natural connexion with the things proved, and do manifeſt and lay open the objects themſelves; the other is*, per principia extrinſeca *(by extrinſecal Principles) that is, ſuch as have no natural or neceſſary connexion with, nor do produce any ſuch evident manifeſtation of the things proved, but their efficacy*, (viz. *whereby they determine the underſtanding to aſſent*) *doth wholly depend on the worth and vertue of that external Principle, whereby ſuch probations are made. This* you apply *to Knowledge and Faith, that as Knowledge proceeds in the former way, ſo Faith doth in the latter, which depends purely upon extrinſecal Principles*, viz, *the Authority, Veracity, Goodneſs and Knowledge of God affirming it; which was immediately known to the Prophets and Apoſtles, but mediately to us, which however, muſt be infallibly conveyed to us, which can only be by the teſtimony of the Church.* This is the ſubſtance of your third Section; to which I anſwer, 1. That all *Certainty* in the acts of the *Mind*, whether in *Knowledge* or *Faith*, muſt equally ſuppoſe the *Truth* of ſome *extrinſecal Principles*, viz. *the veracity and goodneſs of God:* for otherwiſe we cannot certainly judge of thoſe you call *Principia intrinſeca*, to know what things have

§. 17.

Ibid.

have neceſſary and natural connexion with the things proved. For, unleſs I ſuppoſe that *God* is ſo *True* and *Good*, as not to ſuffer Men to be deceived in the proper *actings* of my *Faculties*, I may judge ſuch things to have connexions and dependencies one upon another, which really have nothing ſo. And therefore, ſo far your diſtinction concerning *Science and Faith*, will not hold. But, 2. If the meaning of this diſtinction be only this, That there is a different proceeding in a *demonſtration*, from what there is in *an act of Faith*, I deny it not; but ſuppoſe it nothing to your purpoſe. For, tho' the *evidence* be diſcovered in a *different way*, yet there is in both proportionable *evidence* to the *nature* of the *Aſſent*. When I *aſſent*, becauſe I know that the thing is *true*, the *evidence* of the *thing* it ſelf, is the *ground* of that Aſſent; but, when I *aſſent* upon the *Authority* of any *perſon*, the *Credibility* of his *Teſtimony* is the *evidence* on which that *Aſſent* is grounded. Though this latter *evidence* be of another *kind*, yet it is ſufficient for that *act* of the *mind*, which is built upon it; and that Teſtimony which I eſtabliſh a firm *Aſſent* upon, muſt be as *evident* in its kind, *i. e.* of *Credibility*, as the *evidence* of a thing *demonſtrable* in the nature of a *Demonſtration*. 3. The main ſtrength of your *Anſwer* ſeems to lie in this, *That in ſuch an Aſſent as is built upon Authority; as in the caſe of Faith, when we do not immediately hear God ſpeaking, but it is conveyed to us by the Teſtimony of others, it is neceſſary that this Teſtimony be infallible.* But, good Sir, this is not our preſent Queſtion. Whether it be neceſſary that this Teſtimony be *infallibly conveyed* to us, but, ſuppoſing ſuch an *infallible Conveyance*, Whether that *infallible Teſtimony* muſt not be more *credible* than the *matters* which are believed upon it? But, as though never any ſuch thing had been ſtarted, You give us a long diſcourſe of the *different proceeding of Science and Faith*, but never offer to apply it to the buſineſs in hand. I muſt therefore ingenuouſly commend you for an excellent Art of *gliding inſenſibly* away from a buſineſs you cannot anſwer, and caſting out a great many words not to the purpoſe, that you may ſeem to touch the matter, when you are far enough from it.

And therefore I ſay, Secondly, *That however the evidence proceeds in matters of Faith, yet whatever is the Foundation of Aſſent, muſt be more evident than the thing aſſented to.* Eſpecially where you ſuppoſe the *Aſſent* to be *infallible*, and the *Teſtimony Infallible*, which muſt aſcertain it to us. This will be plainer by an inſtance. If I ask you, why you believe *the Reſurrection of the dead*, your Anſwer is, becauſe of the *Authority* of him that reveals it: The next Queſtion then is, Why you believe *that God hath revealed it*; your Anſwer is, *Becauſe the Teſtimony of the Church is infallible which delivers it:* Whereby it is plain, That though your firſt Anſwer be from *God's Authority*, yet the laſt reſolution of your *Faith*, is, the *Infallibility of your Churches Teſtimony*; and that being the *laſt reſolution*, that *Infallibility* muſt be the *Principle* on which the belief of the reſt depends. For, according to your Principles, *though God had revealed it*, yet if this *Revelation* were not atteſted by the *Infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church*, we ſhould not have ſufficient ground to believe it. And if without that, we can have no ſufficient ground to believe, then this *Principle The Church is infallible*, muſt be more *credible* than *the Reſurrection of the dead*. Which was the Abſurdity his Lordſhip charged upon you, and you are far from being able to quit your ſelf of.

§ 18. The next thing which you buſie your ſelf much in anſwering of, is, *That according to theſe Principles of reſolution of Faith, you make the Churches Teſtimony the formal Object of Faith, which you acknowledge your ſelf to be a great*

great Abſurdity, and therefore make uſe of many ſhifts to avoid. I ſhall reduce the ſubſtance of your verboſe, and immethodical Anſwer into as narrow a compaſs as I can, without defalking any thing of the ſtrength of it. You tell us then, *That our Faith is reſolved into God's Revelations, whether written, or unwritten, as its Formal Object, and our Infallible Aſſurance, that the things we believe as God's Revelations are revealed from him, is reſolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions, teaching us, that they are his Revelations; And that the Formal Cauſe of our Aſſent in Divine Faith, is God's Revelation delivered to the Church without writing; but becauſe that is as it were at diſtance from us, it is approximated, or immediately applied to us by the infallible Declaration of the preſent Church. Hence it appears, our Faith reſts only upon God's Revelation as its Formal Object, though the Churches Voice be a condition ſo neceſſary for its reſting thereon, that it can never attain that Formal Object without it. And laſtly,* you tell us, *The Churches Authority then being more known to us than the Scriptures, may well be ſome reaſon of our admitting them, yet the Scriptures ſtill retain their prerogative above the Church: and thence you diſtinguiſh of the certainty of the Object and Subject; from all which you conclude, That the Churches Definition is not the Formal Object of Faith, but that our Faith relies upon it as an Infallible Witneſs both of the written and unwritten Word of God, which is the Formal Object.* This is the ſubſtance, in your long Anſwer, of what hath the face of reaſon and pertinency: Which I come to a cloſe and particular examination of. And that you may not ſay, I paſs over this important Controverſie, without a through diſcuſſion of it; I ſhall firſt prove, that it neceſſarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Teſtimony muſt be the Formal Object of Faith. And 2. That the Anſwers you give are far from being ſatisfactory that it is not.

1. *That it neceſſarily follows from your Principles, That the Churches Infallible Teſtimony muſt be the Formal Object of Faith.* In order to which, we muſt conſider, what the ſcope and ſign of this Diſcourſe is, concerning the *Reſolution of Faith.* The Queſtion ſtarted by Mr. *Fiſher*, in the *Conference*, was *How his Lordſhip knew Scripture to be Scripture*, or, *How the Divine Authority of the Scriptures was to be proved.* To this his Lordſhip returns a large Anſwer, to which you attempt a Reply in this Chapter, and mention this to be the main queſtion, *How Scriptures may be known to be the Word of God. To this*, you tell us, *No ſatisfactory Anſwer can be given, but from the Infallible Teſtimony of the Church, and the great reaſon given by you in all your diſcourſe, is this, That this is an Article to be believed with Divine Faith, and Divine Faith muſt be built on an Infallible Teſtimony.* The Queſtion then reſulting hence, is, Whether on theſe *Principles* you do not make the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church*, the *Formal Object* of *Faith?* You deny, and we affirm it; but before I come to the particular Evidences of the Cauſe, ſome general *poſtulata* muſt be laid down, which by the very *ſtate* of the Controverſie, muſt be acknowledged by you, which are;

1. That the Queſtion in diſpute is not concerning the *Formal* Object of all things *divinely revealed*, but concerning the believing this to be a *particular Divine Revelation.* For, it is obvious to any one that conſiders, what vaſt difference there is between thoſe two Queſtions, *Why you believe that to be True which God hath revealed*; the plain and eaſie reſolution of this, is, into the *veracity and Infallibility of God*, in all his Revelations. But it is quite another Queſtion, when I ask, *Why you believe this to have been a True Divine Revelation?* Or that ſuch particular Books con-

tain the Word of *God*. And it is apparent, by the whole process of the Dispute, that the Question is not concerning the *first*, but the *second* of these two.

2. That the Question is not concerning any *kind of perswasion*, as to this Divine Revelation, but concerning that which you call *Divine Faith*.

3. That this *Divine Faith must be resolved into some Testimony supposed infallible*. These three are things agreed on between both parties, as appears by the whole management of this Controversie. Only you suppose this *Infallible Testimony* to be the *Church*, which your Adversary denies, and saith, It will follow from thence, that you make your *Churches Testimony the Formal Object of Faith*, which I thus prove.

1. That which is the only *Ground* and *Foundation* whereon a *Divine Faith* is built, must be the *Formal Object of Faith*: but the Infallible Testimony of your *Church*, is the only *Foundation* whereon *Faith* is built. By the *Formal Object of Faith*, I suppose you and I mean the same thing, which is the *Foundation* whereon the *Certainty* of the *Assent* is grounded, or the principal *Objective Cause of Faith*, *viz.* not every account that may be given *Why Men believe*, but that which is the only *Certain Foundation* to establish a *Divine Faith* upon. Now, let any one but consider what the *Question* is, and what your resolution is, and then judge, Whether you make not the *Churches Testimony* the *Formal Object*. The Question is, How we know the *Scriptures to be the Word of God*; which in other terms is *What the ground is why I assent to the Doctrine contained in Scripture as a Divine Revelation?* You say, The *Testimony of the Scripture it self* cannot be that *ground*; You say, The *Testimony of the Spirit cannot be it*; You say, A *Moral Certainty* cannot be it, because then it is not *Divine Faith*: What then is the reason why you believe it? Do you not over and over say, It is *because of the infallible Testimony of the Church, which gives us unquestionable assurance that this was a Divine Revelation*; and yet for all this, this Testimony is not *the Formal Object* of this *Divine Faith*. The most charitable apprehension I can have of you, when you write things so inconsistent, is either that you understand not, or consider not what you write of, but take what hath been said in such cases by Men of your own *party*, and right or wrong that serves for an Answer. But for all this, you tell us
P. 58. n. 4. confidently, *That your Faith is not resolved into the voice of the Church, as into its Formal Object; but it is enough to say, Our Faith is resolved into God's Revelations (whether written or unwritten) as its Formal Object: and our infallible assurance, that the things we believe are Divine Revelations, is resolved into the Infallibility of the Churches Definitions.* These are excellent Notions if they would hang together. But,

1. We enquire not what is *enough to say* in such a case, but what *ground* you have for saying what you do. You have *enough to say* upon many subjects in this Book (or else your Book would never have swell'd to the bulk it hath) but you have generally very *little reason* for *what you say*.

2. Is that *infallible Assurance*, that the *things* we believe as *God's Revelations*, are revealed from him, a thing call'd *Faith* or no? If it be, as I hope you will not deny it, then by your own Confession, *Faith* is resolved into the *Churches Testimony* as its Formal Object; for, you say, This *Infallible Assurance* is resolved into the *Infallibility* of the *Churches* Definitions, teaching us, that they are his *Revelations*. These are your own words. And, do you yet deny this Testimony of the *Church* to be the *Formal Object of this Infallible Assurance?*

3. What

3. What is it you mean, when you ſay, That *Faith is reſolved into God's Revelations as its Formal Object?* Is it, that the *reaſon* why we believe, is, *Becauſe God hath revealed theſe things to us?* But that, you know, is not the *matter* at all in queſtion, but, How we come to aſſent to ſuch a *Doctrine* as a *Divine Revelation?* Anſwer me punctually to it; Can you poſſibly reſolve your Faith into any thing elſe, as its *Formal Object?* If you can, I pray do us the favour to name it. If you reſolve this *Faith*, as you ſeem to expreſs your mind, *into Divine Revelation*, as its Formal Object; Shew us where that *Revelation* is extant, for which you believe *Scripture to be the Word of God.* Is it the *Scripture* it ſelf, or a *Revelation* diſtinct from it? If you ſay, It is the *Scripture it ſelf*, then you muſt make the *Infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church* needleſs; for then we may have *Infallible Aſſurance*, that the things we believe are *Divine Revelations*, without your *Churches Teſtimony* or Definitions: Then, what is become of the *unwritten Tradition* you mention in theſe words? If then it be demanded, *Why we believe ſuch Books as are contained in the Bible to be the Word of God; we anſwer, Becauſe it is a Divine unwritten Tradition, that they are his Word; and this Divine Tradition is the Formal Object, whereon our Faith relies.* P. 59. Well then, our laſt reſolution of Faith is into this Divine unwritten Tradition: But whence come you to know, that this *Tradition is Divine?* Into what *Revelation* is the belief of that finally reſolved? Doth it appear to be ſo by *it ſelf*, and then why may not the *Scripture?* Or hath it ſome other *Revelation*, and *Divine Tradition* to atteſt it? And then the ſame Queſtion returns concerning that, and ſo *in infinitum*, or elſe of neceſſity you muſt acknowledge one of theſe two things; Either that ſome *Divine Revelation* may ſufficiently manifeſt it ſelf, without any *Infallible Teſtimony* of your *Church:* Or elſe, that this *Infallible Teſtimony* muſt be the *Formal Object of Faith.* Of theſe two, chuſe which you pleaſe.

2. I prove that you muſt make the *Churches Teſtimony* the *Formal Object of Faith*, becauſe either you muſt make it ſo, or you muſt deny *Divine Revelation* to be the *Formal Object* of Faith; becauſe the reaſon is equal for both. I demand then, How you reſolve your *Belief* of the *Truth* of the *Doctrine of Chriſt?* You tell me, into *Divine Revelation*, as its *Formal Object.* I ask yet further, Why you believe the *Revelation made by Chriſt to be Divine?* Your Anſwer muſt be, either that your *Churches* Teſtimony gives you *Infallible Aſſurance* of it, and then the former Argument returns: Or elſe that *Chriſt manifeſted his Teſtimony to be Infallible*, and therefore his *Revelation Divine*, becauſe of the *Motives of Credibility*, which accompanied his Preaching. If this be your Anſwer, as it muſt be by your former diſcourſe, then by the ſame reaſon I prove your *Churches Teſtimony* to be the *Formal Object of Faith*, becauſe you have endeavoured to prove the *Churches Infallibility* by the ſame *Motives of Credibility that Moſes and Chriſt proved theirs.* Either therefore retract all your former Diſcourſe, or elſe confeſs, that by the ſame reaſon that the *Divine Revelation* made by Chriſt, is the *Formal Object of Faith*, the *Infallible Teſtimony* of your Church muſt be ſo too. For according to your own ſuppoſition, there are *equal Motives of Credibility*, and therefore equal obligation to believe the *Infallibility* of one as of the other.

3. If the only reaſon which makes any thing to be the *Formal Object* agrees to the *Teſtimony* of your *Church*, then that Teſtimony muſt be the *Formal Object of Faith* to them that believe it. Now, that which is the only reaſon which makes any thing to be the *formal Object of Faith*, is the Suppoſition that it is *Infallible.* For, why do you reſolve your Faith finally into

Divine Revelation? Is it not becauſe you ſuppoſe *God* to be *Infallible* in all Revelations of himſelf; and therefore if your *Church be Infallible*, as you ſay it is, by the ſame reaſon that muſt be the *formal Object of Faith*; as if it were by the Revelation of *God* himſelf. But here you think to obviate this objection by ſome ſtrange diſtinctions concerning your *Infallibility*. You tell us therefore, *The Churches Infallibility is not abſolutely and ſimply*
P. 58, 59. *Divine; or that God ſpeaks immediately by her Definitions: But only that ſhe is ſupernaturally Infallible, by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt preſerving her from all Error, in defining any thing as a point of Chriſtian Faith, that is, as a Truth revealed from God, which is not truly and really ſo revealed.* A rare Diſtinction this! You ſay afterwards, *The Churches Definition is abſolutely Infallible, but yet this Infallibility is not abſolutely and ſimply Divine:* I pray tell us, What is it then? You ſay, It is *Supernatural*, but not *Divine*, and this *Supernatural Infallibility, by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt ſecuring from all Error*, but yet not *abſolutely and preciſely Divine:* I pray tell us, What *kind* of *Infallibility* that was which the *Apoſtles* had in delivering the *Doctrine of Chriſt* was, that any more than ſuch a *Supernatural Infallibility* as you fondly arrogate to your *Church*, *viz.* ſuch a one as might ſecure them from all Error in defining any thing as a point of *Chriſtian Faith*, which was not ſo, that is, as a *Truth revealed from God*, which was not truly and really ſo revealed. And yet, I ſuppoſe, you will not deny, but thoſe who lived in the *Apoſtles* times, might reſolve their *Faith* into that *Infallibility* which they had as its *formal Object*, and therefore why not as well into your *Churches Infallibility*, ſince you pretend to as great Infallibility in your *Church* as ever was in the *Apoſtles*. Thus, I hope, I have ſhewn it impoſſible for you, not to make the Churches Teſtimony the Formal Object of Faith, ſince you make it infallible as you do.

2. We come now to conſider, the *little Evaſions* and *Diſtinctions*, whereby you hope to get out of this *Labyrinth*. But having ſo manifeſtly proved, that it follows from your Principles, That the *Churches Teſtimony* is the *formal Object of Faith*, all your diſtinctions fall of themſelves; for thereby it appears, that your *Churches* Teſtimony is not meerly a *neceſſary Condition* of believing, but is the *formal Cauſe* and *Reaſon* of it, there-
P. 59. fore your inſtance of *Approximation in natural Cauſes, is nothing to the purpoſe*. No more is that of a *Commonwealths practiſing the ſame Laws, being an Argument that thoſe were its primitive Laws:* Unleſs you ſuppoſe it impoſſible, 1. That a *Commonwealth* ſhould ever alter its *Laws*. Or, 2. That it ſhould *practiſe* contrary to its *Primitive Laws*. Or, 3. That it ſhould be *ſupernaturally Infallible* in judging which are *Primitive Laws*, and which not; without theſe Suppoſitions, I ſay, That Inſtance ſignifies nothing to the buſineſs in hand; and when you have proved theſe true, I will give you a further Anſwer. Your Anſwer to *Ariſtotle*'s *Text*, or rather to that *undoubted Maxim of Reaſon*, with which the Citation of *Ariſtotle* concurred, hath been conſidered already. Your Anſwer to the Teſtimony of *Canus*, is like the reſt of your Diſcourſe, trivial, and not to the purpoſe; for *Canus* doth not only deny the *Churches Teſtimony* to be the *formal Object* of *Faith*, but the neceſſity of believing its *Teſtimony* to be *Infallible*.
P. 62. *Non intelligitur neceſſariò, quod credo docenti Eccleſiæ tanquam teſti infallibili*, are the very words of the Teſtimony cited in the Margin of his Lordſhip's Books.

Your next *Section* affords us ſome more words, but not one drachm more of Reaſon. For, How do you prove, *that the Churches Authority is more known to us than the Scriptures?* Or, How can you make it appear, that

that there is any *Authority*, but what is *relative* to us, and therefore the distinction is in it self silly, of *Authority in se, & quoad nos.* For, whatever hath *Authority*, hath thereby a respect *to some* it hath its *Authority* over. And, can any thing be a ground of Faith *simply and in it self*, which is not so *towards us?* For the *Formal Object of Faith*, is that for whose sake we believe; and therefore, if *Divine Revelation* be, as you say, the *Formal Object of Faith*, then it must be more *known to us*, than the Testimony of the Church: For, that must be more *known to us*, which is the main cause of *Believing*. But, if all your meaning be, that we must first know what the *Church delivers for Scripture*, before we can judge whether it were *Divinely revealed* or no: I grant it to be true; but what is this to your Infallibility? Will you prove the *Infallibility of your Church* to be more *known to us*, than that of the *Scriptures*; and, on supposition that were true, can you then prove that the Scriptures should still retain their Prerogative above the Church? What your Authors distinguish concerning *objective and subjective Certainty*, pertains not to this place; for the worth and dignity of the *Scriptures*, may exceed that of Tradition, yet, when the knowledge of that wroth, relies on that Tradition, your esteem of the one, must be according to your esteem of the other. I will not here enquire, *Whether the adhesion of the Will, can exceed the clearness of the Understanding*; nor, *Whether* Aristotle *was unacquainted with subjective Certainty*; nor, *Whether our adhesion to Articles of Faith, be stronger than to any Principles evident to natural Reason:* For, I look upon all these Assertions to serve you in no other capacity, than as excursions from the matter in hand; and therefore I shall not gratifie you so far as particularly to examine them. For all then that hath been yet produced by you, his Lordship's Argument remains good, that, according to your Principles, *the Churches Testimony must be made the Formal Object of Faith*, and I am the more confirmed in it by the weakness of your Evasions; and, I hope, I have now made good those words which you challenge his Lordship for, *That it were no hard thing to prove it.*

The next Absurdity charged upon you by his Lordship, is, *That all the Authorities of Fathers, Councils, nay, of Scripture too, must be finally resolved into the Authority of the present* Roman *Church: And, though they would seem to have us believe the Fathers, and the Church of old; yet they will not have us take their Doctrine from their own Writings, or the Decrees of Councils, because, as they say, we cannot know by reading them, what their meaning was, but from the Infallible Testimony of the present* Roman *Church teaching by Tradition. And this, he tells you, is the cunning of this Device.* To which you answer; *By what hath been said, it appears, That there is no Device or Cunning at all, either in taking away any thing due to the Fathers, Councils, or Scripture; or in giving too much to the Tradition of the present Church. For we acknowledge all due respect to the Fathers, and as much (to speak modestly) as any of our Adversaries Party. But they must pardon us, if we prefer the general interpretation of the present Church, before the result of any Man's particular Fansie. As for Scripture, we ever extol it above the Definitions of the Church, yet affirm it to be in many places so obscure, that we cannot be certain of its true sense, without the help of a living, infallible Judge, to determine and declare it, which can be no other than the present Church. And what we say of Scripture, may, with proportion, be applied to ancient General Councils. For, though we willingly submit to them all, yet where they happen to be obscure in matters requiring Determination, we seek the assistance and direction of the same living Infallible*

§. 19. P. 62.

P. 60, 61.

fallible Rule, viz. the *Tradition, or the Sentence of the present Church.* The Question is, *Supposing your Churches Testimony to be Infallible, without which we can have no Assurance of what Fathers, Scriptures, and Councils say, What Authority remains among you, to any, or all of these?* And it is not, what respect, *you tell us*, you give them; (for you may as easily speak, as believe contradictions) but what is *really* left to them, if your Opinion concerning the present Churches Infallibility be true. And he that cannot see the *Cunning of this Device* of resolving all into the Authority of the *present Roman Church*, will never understand the Interest of your *Church*; but, it seems, you apprehend it so much, as not to seem to do it, and have too much *cunning* to confess it. But, this must not be so easily passed over, this being one of the grand *Artifices* of your *Church*, to make a great noise with *Fathers*, *Scriptures* and *Councils* among those most, who understand them least, when your selves resolve them all into the *present Churches Testimony.* Which is first to *gag them*, and then *bid them speak.*

First, For the *Fathers*, you say, *You acknowledge all due respect to them*; but the Question is, What kind of *respect* that is which *can be due* to them, when, let them speak their minds never so plainly, and agree in what they please, and deliver what they will as the *Judgment* of the *Church*; yet all this can give us no *Assurance* at all on your Principles, unless your *Church* doth infallibly determine the same way. What then do the *Fathers* signifie with you? Doth the Infallibility of your *Churches Definition* depend on the consent of the *Fathers? No*, you tell us, *She is supernaturally assisted by the Holy Ghost*; and if so, I suppose the judgment of the *Fathers* is not that which she relies on. But, it may be, you will say; *This supernatural Assistance directs the Church to that which was the judgment of the Fathers in all Ages.* This were something indeed, if it could be proved: But then I would never read the *Fathers*, to know what their mind is, but ask your *Church* what they meant: And, though your *Church* delivers that as their sense, which is as opposite as may be, both to their words and judgments; yet this is part of the *respect* due to them, not to believe whatever *they say themselves*, but what *your Church* tells us *they say.* A most compendious way for interpreting *Fathers*, and making them sure not to speak any thing against your *Church.* Therefore I cannot but commend the Ingenuity of *Cornelius Mussus*, the *Bishop of Bitonto*, who speaks that out, which more wary Men are contented only to think. *Ego, ut ingenuè fatear, plus uni summo Pontifici crediderim in his quæ mysteria fidei tangunt, quàm mille Augustinis, Hieronymis, Gregoriis, That I may deal freely*, saith he, *I would sooner believe the Pope in Matters of Faith, than a thousand* Augustines, Hieromes, *and* Gregories. Bravely said, and like a Man that did heartily believe the *Pope's Infallibility!* And yet no more than every one will be forced to do that understands the Consequence of his own Principles. And therefore *Alphonsus à Castro* was not to be blamed *for preferring an Epistle of* Anacletus (though counterfeit) *because Pope, before* Augustine, Hierome, *or any other, however holy or learned.* These Men understood themselves, and the Interest of their *Church.* And, although the rest of them make *finer Legs* to the *Fathers* than these do; yet when they seem to *cross* their way, and entrench upon their *Church*, they find not much *kinder entertainment* for them. We may guess at the rest by two of them, Men of great Note in their several ways, the one for *Controversies*, the other for his *Commentaries*, viz. *Bellarmine* and *Maldonate*, and let us see, when occasion serves, how rudely they handle

In cap. 14. ep. ad Rom.

Huic Anacleto soli magis crediderim, &c. quàm Hieronymo, Augustino, aut cuivis alii recentiori, quantumlibet docto & sancto. Adverss. hæres. l. 6. verbo Episcopus.

handle the *Fathers*. If S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks againſt Tradition, it was, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *In defence of his errour, and therefore no wonder if he argued after the manner of erroneous perſons.* If he oppoſeth *Stephen the Biſhop of Rome*, in the buſineſs of *Rebaptization*; *He ſeemeth*, ſaith he, *to have erred mortally in it.* If S. *Ambroſe pronounce Baptiſm in the name of Chriſt, to be valid, without the naming other Perſons in the Trinity*; *Bellarmine* is not afraid to ſay, *That, in his judgment, his Opinion is falſe.* If S. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith. *That it is better not to be preſent at the Euchariſt, than to be preſent, and not receive it:* I ſay (ſaith *Bellermine*) *That* Chryſoſtome, *as at other times went beyond his bounds in ſaying ſo.* If S. *Auguſtine* expound a place of Scripture not to his mind, he tells him roundly, *He did not throughly conſider what he ſaid* Do not theſe things argue that due reſpect they had for the *Fathers?* So long as they think they can make them ſerve their turns, then *Who but the Fathers?* If they appear refractary, and will not ſerve as *hewers of wood*, and *drawers of water* to them, then *Who are the Fathers?* it is the *Churches* judgment they rely on, and not the *Fathers*. And therefore they never want ways themſelves of eluding all the Teſtimonies produced out of them: If they cannot ſay, thoſe *Teſtimonies* are *forged* (as ſome of them ſay it, without any ſhew of reaſon, concerning that part of the Epiſtle of *Epiphanius*, about the tearing the veil, in which an Image was painted at *Anablatha.*) And as *Bellarmine* anſwers concerning the Author of the *imperfect work* on *Matthew*, becauſe he ſaith, *There is no way to the finding Truth, but reading the Scriptures*; he therefore ſaith, This whole place was inſerted by the *Arrians*; as though that had been any part of the *Controverſie* between the *Arrians* and others. If *Origen*, or *Cyril*, on *Leviticus*, ſaith, *It is neceſſary to follow the Scriptures*, then an Anſwer is ready, That theſe *Homilies* are of no great Authority: but if theſe will ſerve *to defend the Apocrypha*; if they ſpeak of the *Obſcurity of Scripture*; if they mention *the Obſervation of Lent*; if they ſpeak of any thing *tending to Auricular Confeſſion*, or *Penance*, then they are good and authentick enough. Thus the price of the *Fathers* riſes and falls according to their *Uſe*, like *Slaves* in the market. If yet the *Fathers* ſeem to deliver their judgments peremptorily in a matter contrary to the preſent ſenſe of their *Church*, then either they ſpeak it in the *heat of diſputation*, or, if not, they were *contradicted* by *others* as good as they; if many of them concur, yet it was but their *private judgment*, not the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* which they delivered. Still we ſee, the *rate* the *Fathers* ſtand at, is their agreement with the *preſent Roman-Church*, if they differ from this, they were *Men* like others, and might be deceived, only the *Pope* is *Infallible*, or at leaſt the *preſent Roman-Church.* For, if *Hilary*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Cyril*, *Auguſtine*, and others ſay, that Chriſt, when he ſaid, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church*, underſtood *Peter's Confeſſion* or *himſelf*, *Nihil magis alienum à ſenſu Chriſti cogitari potuit*, ſaith *Maldonate*, *Nothing could be more incongruous than what they ſay.* And in the next words tells us, *That all the Ancient Writers except* Hilary, *expounded, the gates of Hell one way, but he gives another ſenſe of them.* The ſame liberty he takes in very many other places. By which we have a *taſte* of that *due reſpect* which you owe to the *Fathers*, which is, *To value them, as far as they concur with your Church, and no more*; otherwiſe they are but the reſults of Mens particular fancies, and

Reſpondeo, Cyprianum hoc ſcripſiſſe cùm errorem ſuum tueri vellet, & ideo non mirum ſi errantium more tunc ratiocinaretur. De verbo Dei, l. 4. c. 11.

Videtur, mortaliter peccâſſe. De Pontif. R. l. 4. c. 7.

Hæc Opinio falſa eſt, meo judicio. De Pontif. l. 4. c. 12.

Dico, Chryſoſtomum ut quædam alia per exceſſum ita locutum eſſe. De Miſſa. l. 2. c. 10.

Reſpondeo, Auguſtinum non expendiſſe locum hunc diligenter. De Euch. l. 1. c. 11.

De verbo Dei. l. 4. c. 11.

Ibid.

Dict. D. *l.* 1. c. 9. *l* 3. c. 1. *l.* 4. c. 9.

De Pœnit. *l.* 3. c. 7. *l.* 4. c. 9.

In Mat. 16. 18.

In Mat. 21. 9.

In Mat. 19. 11.

In Joh. 6. n. 69.

In Joh. 6. n. 116.

and not to be compared with the *infallible Judgment* of your *Church.*

§. 20. But, tho' it may not be ſo evident, that you give ſo great reſpect to the *Fathers*, yet it is notorious what reverence you ſhew to the *ſacred Scriptures. As for Scripture* (ſay you) *we ever extol it above the Definitions of the Church:* What, *ever*! Do you think we have forgot the brave compariſons which have been made by your Writers, to ſhew the reſpect you bear to the Scriptures? Is it not much for the honour of the *Scriptures*, to be ſaid to have *no more Authority than Æſops Fables, without the Teſtimony of the Church?* Did not thoſe extol it *above the Church*, who call'd it, *A Noſe of Wax?* and were not theſe ſome of you? Doth not *Bellarmine* profeſs his high eſteem of the Scriptures, when he ſaith, That *the Scripture is no more to be believed, in ſaying It is from God than Mahomets Alcoran, becauſe that ſays ſo too?* Did not *Caranza prefer the Scripture before the Church*, when he ſaid, *that the Scripture muſt be regulated by the Church, and not the Church by the Scripture?* I need not mention *Eckius* his *Evangelium nigrum* and *Theologia atramentaria*, *Pighius* his *plumbea Lesbiæ regula*, *Valentia* his *Lapis Offenſionis*, *Bellarmine's Commonitorium utile*, which, and many others, are remaining Teſtimonies of *that monſtrous eſteem*, which thoſe of your party have of the *ſacred Scriptures.* But, if the *eſteem* you have of the *Scriptures* be ſo great, why lock you them up ſo carefully from the people in an unknown language? Is it, leſt *ſuch Jewels* ſhould loſe their luſtre by too often uſing? Why are you ſo ſevere againſt your *Proſelytes* reading them? Is it becauſe you would not caſt *Pearls before Swine?*

Hermanus ait, Scripturas valere quantum fabulas Æſopi, ſi diſtituantur Eccleſiæ autoritate: referente Brentio. V. Bailly tract. 1. q. 17.

Sunt Scripturæ, quidam velut naſus cereus, qui ſe horſum, illorſum, trahi, retrahi fingiq; facilè permittit. Albert. Pighius Hierarch. l. 3. c. 3

Etiam ſi ſcriptura dicat, libros Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum eſſe divinos, tamen non credam eſſe, niſi prius hoc credidero Scripturam eſſe divinam: nam in Alcorano Mahumetis poſſum legimus ipſum Alcoranum de cælo à Deo miſſum, & tamen ei non credimus. De verbo Dei, l. 4. c. 4.

Scriptura debet ab Eccleſiâ regulari, & non contra. Caranza Controv. 1.

Pigh. Controverſ. l. 1. c. 2.

Valent. l. 4. c. 2. de Analyſ. Fid.

Bellarm. l. 4. c. 12. de verbo Dei.

But ſtill you extol the Scripture above the Definitions of the *Church:* How is that poſſible, when you tell us, *The only Authority it hath, is from the Churches Teſtimony?* For the *Authority* of it ſuppoſeth it to be acknowledged for a *Divine Revelation*, and that, you tell us, we can have no Aſſurance of, but from your *Churches Definition:* And we had thought, that which gave *Credit* and *Authority*, had been greater than that which *received* it. There can be then little reaſon to take your word in a caſe of this nature, when your very next words give ſo palpable a reaſon to the contrary. For you ſuppoſe *the Scripture unable to expreſs it ſelf to any intent or purpoſe, unleſs your Church be the Interpreter. For the Scripture*, ſay you, *being in many places obſcure, we cannot be certain of its true ſenſe, without the help of a living and infallible Judge, to determine and declare it; which can be no other than the preſent Church.* I anſwer, 1. Your meaning is not ſo plain, but that it wants the interpretation of your *Church* too. For what do you underſtand by the *Scriptures being in many places obſcure?* Is it only, that there are ſome paſſages which have their *difficulties* in them? But what is this to the purpoſe, unleſs you could prove, that this *obſcurity* is ſuch as hinders it from being a *Rule of Faith and Manners?* If you prove that, you do ſomething. The *Scripture* we acknowledge hath its *difficulties* in it, but not ſuch as hinder the great deſign *God* intended it for; no more than the *maculæ* which are in the *Sun*, hinder it from giving light to the world; or ſome *crabbed pieces* in our *Laws* hinder them from being owned as the *Laws of the Land.* 2. Are thoſe places *obſcure* or no, which ſpeak of the *Churches Infallibility?* at leaſt ſuch as you produce for it afterwards? This is evident, that there are no places whoſe ſenſe is more *controverted* than theirs: Can theſe then be underſtood without

out a *living* and *infallible Judge*, or no? If they may, ſo as we may be certain of their true ſenſe, then why not all others which concern the *Rule of Faith* and manners, whoſe ſenſe is far leſs diſputed than of theſe? if not, then we muſt ſuppoſe a *living and infallible Judge*, before we know whether there is ſuch *a one* or no: For that is the thing enquired after in the meaning of theſe *places*, and you ſay, We cannot be certain of their *ſenſe* without him, ſo that we muſt firſt ſuppoſe the thing to be *true*, and then *prove it*; or elſe you run back again into your old *Labyrinth*. *How know you that God hath promiſed, there ſhall be ſuch an infallible Judge? By ſuch places* (ſay you) *as you produce for it.* Well, but the *Scripture being in many places obſcure*, How ſhall I be certain this is the true ſenſe of them? You ſay, becauſe the *preſent Church is the living and infallible Judge to determine and declare it*. Do not you herein argue like a Man. that can *ſquare Circles?* 3. In thoſe places whoſe *ſenſe*, you ſay, is ſo *obſcure*, where hath *God* made it neceſſary for us to have the certain *ſenſe* of them? You can have no pretence for all this for an infallible Judge, unleſs you could make it evident, that *God* hath left no myſteries in his Word, but he hath left your *Church* a *Key* to unlock them; and therefore, I hope, there is a *Clavis Apocalyptica* too hanging at your *Churches Girdle*. It is true indeed, your *Church* is happily inſtrumental in explaining a *myſtery* ſpoken of in Scripture, but not much for your comfort, it's a *myſtery of Iniquity*. But in good earneſt, do you think *That God hath promiſed a living and infallible Judge to make us certain of the ſenſe of obſcure places in Scripture?* Then two things will neceſſarily follow from thence. 1. That it muſt be neceſſary, that all thoſe that believe this *infallible Judge* muſt know the certain *ſenſe* of theſe *obſcure places*. 2. That this infallible *Judge* muſt give the certain ſenſe of theſe places. But then, Why hath your *preſent Church* ſo neglected her *Talent* this way, that ſhe hath not decided all the Controverſies concerning the *difficiliora loca?* Such a *Commentary* as this were worth inquiring after. But yet ſuppoſing your *Church* had done this, Could we be more certain of the *ſenſe* of your *Church*, than we are now of the *Scriptures?* I will ſuppoſe your *Church* ſo charitable, as to put ſo uſeful a thing in writing, for the general good of the world: But *all Writings* (you tell us) *are obſcure, and want a living Judge to interpret them*; and ſo conſequently muſt that, and ſo in *infinitum*. But 4. All this while it is worth underſtanding, how you prefer the *Scripture before the Church*, when you make the *Church the living and infallible Judge*, to interpret the *Scriptures*. You make the Scripture a *dead Letter*, but your Church is a *living Judge*; you make the *ſence* of Scripture *obſcure*, *uncertain*, and therefore giving occaſion to all the *errours* in the world, but your *Church is infallible*, to determine all Controverſies, and yet for all this, you *prefer the Scripture before the Church*. It is plain, you do not, in regard of *evidence* and *certainty*; and one would have thought, theſe had been the greateſt *Excellencies* of a *Rule of Faith*. Do you prefer it as ſuch before your *Church?* If not, you deny it the peculiar *property* and *deſign* of it; and therefore whatever elſe you attribute to it, you are guilty of the higheſt diſparagement of it. Juſt as if one ſhould commend a *Mathematicians Square* for the *materials* of it, or the *Excellency* of the *Figures* engraven on it; but, in the mean time, tell him, It is *oblique*, *crooked*, *uncertain*, and he cannot draw a *ſtraight line* by it: Do you think he would believe you commended his *Square?* Juſt ſo do you commend the *Scriptures*; and can you then imagine, that any rational Man will believe, that you *do prefer the Scriptures before the preſent Church?*

§. 21. It is next to be conſidered, what *reſpect* remains *due* to *general Councils*, if the *preſent Church* be ſuppoſed infallible. *For* (ſay you) *though you willingly ſubmit to them all,* P. 61. *yet where they happen to be obſcure in matters requiring Determination, we ſeek the aſſiſtance and direction of the ſame living infallible Rule,* viz. *the Tradition, or the Sentence of the preſent Church.* But 1. You ſay, *You ſubmit to them all:* but, Do you ſubmit to them all as *infallible*, or no? which you muſt of neceſſity do, or elſe apparently contradict your ſelf (which yet is no novelty for you to do) for you ſpend a great deal of pains to prove *general Councils infallible*; and therefore I hope you own them as *infallible* your ſelf. If you own them to be *infallible*, what need of the ſentence of the *preſent Church*, as to thoſe *Decrees* which you already acknowledge infallible? Or, do you really own them no further to be *infallible*, than as they agree with the ſentence of the *preſent Church?* and then, I pray, What doth the pretended *Infallibility* of *general Councils* ſignifie, if your *Church* give all the Authority to them? and what conſents with your *Church* is infallible, and what doth not, is far from being ſo? 2. You ſay, *General Councils may happen to be obſcure in matters requiring Determination*; Do you meam, in *things decreed* by them, or not? If not, it is no wonder if they be obſcure in matters they never meddle with, therefore, I ſuppoſe, you mean in *things determined* by them. Then I further ask, Whether theſe *Decrees of general Councils*, were the *Sentence* of the *preſent Church*, to thoſe who lived in the time of thoſe *Councils?* If they were, How could the Sentence of the *preſent Church* declare and determine the ſenſe of what is *obſcure in Scripture*, if, notwithſtanding this Determination, the Sentence of the *Church* remains as *obſcure*, as the *ſenſe of the Scripture? If it was not obſcure then, but is ſo now*, whence comes that *obſcurity?* The Sentence of the *Council* is ſuppoſed to be written then, that thoſe who were not preſent at it might underſtand the *Decree* of it; and it is ſuppoſed we have the very ſame *Authentical Decrees of Councils*, which they had who lived in the ſeveral *Ages* of them. How come they then to be more obſcure to us, than they were to them? 3. What do you mean by matters *requiring Determination?* Is it not enough that things be infallibly determined once, but they muſt be determined over again? If the former *Determination* were *infallible*, what need any more? or doth the *Infallibility* ceaſe as ſoon as the *Church* ceaſeth to be the *preſent Church*, and then that which comes to be the *preſent Church*, muſt convey an *Infallibility* into it? but how comes any thing which was once infallible, to *loſe its Infallibility*? which is a thing really ſo *obſcure*, that your preſent Church would do well to help us out in it. But if, notwithſtanding all your pretence of the Infallibility of *general Councils*, nothing is truly to be owned as ſuch, but what agrees with the Sentence of the *preſent Church*, then we plainly ſee, what reverence you ſhew to all *general Councils*, even as much as the *preſent Church* will let you, and no more, which, ſuppoſing it never ſo great, is not ſhewed to the *Councils*, but to your *Church*. For, the reaſon of that *Reverence* cannot be reſolved into the *Councils*, but into that *Church* for whoſe ſake you reverence them. And thus it evidently appears, That *the cunning of this device* is wholly your own, and notwithſtanding theſe miſerable ſhifts, you do finally reſolve all Authorities of the *Fathers*, *Councils*, and *Scriptures*, into the Authority of the *preſent Roman Church*; which was the thing to be proved.

§. 22. The firſt *Abſurdity* conſequent from hence, which the *Arch-Biſhop* chargeth your party with, is, *That by this means they aſcribe as great Authority (if not greater) to a part of the Catholick Church, as to the whole, which we believe in our Creed; and which is the Society of all Chriſtians. And this is full of Abſurdity*

dity in nature, in reason, in all things, that any part should be of equal worth, power, credit, or authority with the whole. Here you deny the Consequence, which, you say, *depends upon his Lordship's wilfully mistaken Notion of the Catholick Church; which he saith, Is the Church we believe in our Creed, and is the Society of all Christians; which (you call) a most desperate extension of the Church*; because thereby (forsooth) it will appear, that a part is not so great as the whole, *viz. that the Roman Church, in her full latitude, is but a piece or parcel of the Catholick Church believed in our Creed.* Is this all the desperate *Absurdity*, which follows from his Lordship's Answer? I pray, shew it to have any thing tending to an *Absurdity* in it? And though you confidently tell us, *That the Roman Church, taken as comprizing all Christians that are in her Communion, is the sole and whole Catholick Church*; yet I will contentedly put the whole issue of the cause upon the proof of this one Proposition, that the *Roman Church* in its largest sense, *is the sole and whole Catholick Church*; or that the *present Roman Church* is a sound Member of the *Catholick Church.* Your evidence from *Ecclesiastical History*, is such as I fear not to follow you in; but, I beseech you, have a care of treading too near the *Apostles heels*: That *any were accounted Catholicks meerly for their Communion with the Roman Church*; or *that any were condemned for Heresie or Schism purely for their dissent from it*; prove it when you please, I shall be ready (God willing) to attend your Motions. But it is always your faculty, when a thing needs proving most, to tell us what you *could have done*: This, you say, *You would have proved at large, if his Lordship had any more than supposed the contrary*: But your Readers will think, that his Supposition, being grounded on such a Maxim of Reason, as that mentioned by him, it had been your present business to have proved it: But I commend your prudence in adjourning it; and, I suppose, you will do it, as the *Court of Areopagus* used to do hard causes, *in diem longissimum.* It is apparent, *the Bishop speaks not of a part of the Church by representation of the whole*, which is an objection no body but your self would here have fansied; and therefore your Instance of a *Parliament* is nothing to the purpose, unless you will suppose, that *Councils in the Church* do represent in such a manner as *Parliaments in England* do; and that their decision is obligatory in the same way as *Acts of Parliament* are: If you believe this to be good *Doctrine*, I will be content to take the Objecter's place, and make the *Application.*

The next Absurdity laid to your charge, is, as you sum it up, *That in your Doctrine concerning the Infallibility of your Church, your proceeding is most unreasonable, in regard you will not have recourse to Texts of Scripture, exposition of Fathers, propriety of Language, conference of Places, Antecedents and Consequents*, &c. *but argue, that the Doctrine of the present Church of* Rome, *is true and Catholick, because she professeth it to be such, which, saith he, is to prove* idem per idem. To this you answer, *That as to all those helps you use them with much more candour than Protestants do: And, why so? Because of their manifold wrestings of Scriptures and Fathers.* Let the handling the Controversies of this Book, be the evidence between us in this case, and any indifferent Reader be the Judge. You tell us, *You use all these helps*: But to what purpose do you use them? Do you by them prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church?* If not, the same Absurdity lies at your door still, of proving *idem per idem.* No, *that you do not*, you say: But how doth it appear? Thanks to these *mute Persons*, the *good Motives of Credibility*, which come in again at a *dead lift*, but do no more service than before. I pray, cure the *Wounds* they have received already, before you rally them again, or else, I assure you, what strength they have left, they will employ it against your selves. P. 62.

You ſuppoſe, no doubt, your *Coleworts* good, you give them us ſo often over; but I neither like proving nor eating *idem per idem*.

§. 23. But yet we have two Auxiliaries more in the Field, call'd *Inſtances*. The deſign of your firſt *Inſtance*, is, to ſhew, *That if your Church be guilty of proving* idem per idem, *the Apoſtolical Church was ſo too*. For you tell us, *That a Sectary might, in the Apoſtles times, have argued againſt the Apoſtolical Church, by the very ſame method his Lordſhip here uſes againſt the preſent Catholick Church:*

P. 62, 63. n. 5. *For, if you ask the Chriſtians then, Why they believe the whole Doctrine of the Apoſtles, to be the ſole true Catholick Faith, their Anſwer is, becauſe it is agreeable to the Doctrine of Chriſt. If you ask them, How they know it to be ſo, they will produce the words, ſentences, and works of Chriſt, who taught it. But, if you ask a third time, By what means they are aſſured, that thoſe Teſtimonies do indeed make for them or their cauſe, or are really the Teſtimonies and Doctrine of Chriſt, they will not then have recourſe to thoſe Teſtimonies or Doctrine, but their Anſwer is, They know it to be ſo, becauſe the preſent Apoſtolick Church doth witneſs it. And ſo by conſequence prove* idem per idem. *Thus the Sectary.* I know not whether your faculty be better at framing Queſtions or Anſwers to them; I am ſure it is extraordinary at both. Is it not enough to be in a *Circle* your ſelves, but you muſt needs bring the *Apoſtles* into it too? At leaſt, if you may have the management of their Doctrine, you would do it. The ſhort Anſwer to all this is, That the ground why the *Chriſtians* did aſſent to the *Apoſtles Doctrine*, as true, was, becauſe *God* gave ſufficient evidence, that their *Teſtimony was Infallible*, in ſuch things where ſuch *Infallibility* was requiſite. For you had told us before, That the *Apoſtles did confirm their words with ſigns that followed, by which ſigns all their hearers were bound to ſubmit themſelves unto them, and to acknowledge their words for infallible Oracles of Truth.* Was not here then ſufficient ground for aſſent in the *Primitive Chriſtians*, to the *Apoſtles Doctrine?* Not as you weakly imagine, becauſe the *Doctrine of the Apoſtles* was ſuitable to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*; for the ground why they aſſented to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, was, becauſe of the *Teſtimony* of the *Apoſtles*. And therefore, to ſay, They believed the *Doctrine* of the *Apoſtles*, becauſe it was agreeable to the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, and then that they believed the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, becauſe it was ſuitable to the *Teſtimony* of the *Apoſtles*, is a *Circle* fit for none but your ſelf, and that ſilly Perſon of your own moulding, whom you call the *Sectary*. It were worth conſidering too, *How the works of Chriſt could prove the Doctrine of the Apoſtles ſuitable to his own.* I had thought *Chriſt's works* had proved his own *Teſtimony* to be *true*, and not the *Apoſtles Doctrine* to be conſonant to his: The *works of Chriſt* ſhew us the reaſon, why he was to be believed in what he delivered; and did not the *works of the Apoſtles* do ſo too? What need then any rational Perſon enquire further, why the *Apoſtles Doctrine* was to be believed? Was it not on the ſame account that the *Doctrine of Chriſt* was to be believed? But, ſay you, *How ſhould you know their Doctrine was the ſame?* What, do you want an infallible Teſtimony for this too? Or, do you believe that *God* can contradict himſelf; or that *Chriſt* ſhould ſend ſuch to deliver his *Doctrine* to the World, and atteſt it with *Miracles* who ſhould falſifie and corrupt it? Now, you will ſay, *I am come over to you, and anſwer as you do, that the Apoſtles Teſtimony was to be believed, becauſe of the pregnant and convincing Motives of Credibility.* This, I grant; but muſt be excuſed as to what follows, That *theſe ſame Motives moved the Primitive Chriſtians, and us, in our reſpective times, to believe the Church.* Prove but that, and I yield the cauſe. But till then, I pray, give us leave to believe that ſtill you prove *idem per idem*; and your Anſwers are like your Proofs; for this we have

P. 56.

had

had often already, and have sufficiently examined before: As likewise your other *Coccysm* about the *Formal Object of Faith*, and *certain Inducements* to accept the *Churches Infallibility*; which I shall not think worth repeating, till you think what I have said against it before worth answering.

Your second Instance is, *ad hominem*; whereby you would prove, *That if he acknowledge the Church Infallible in Fundamentals, he must prove* idem per idem, *as much as you do. For* (say you) *if he be demanded a reason why he believes such Points as he calls Fundamental, his Answer is, because they are agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ. If he be asked, How he knows them to be so, he will, no doubt, produce the words, sentences and works of Christ, who taught the said Fundamental Points. But, if he be asked a third time, By what means he is assured, that these Testimonies do make for him, then he will not have recourse to the words themselves,* i. e. *to the Bible, but his final Answer will be, He knows them to be so, and that they do make for him, because the present Church doth infallibly witness so much from Tradition, and according to Tradition, which is* (say you) *to prove* idem per idem, *as much as we.* P. 63. Things are not always just as you would have them: If we allow you to make both Objections and Answers for us, no doubt you are guilty of no Absurdity so great, but we shall be equally guilty of it. But, it is the nature both of your *Religion* and *Arguments* not to be able to stand a *Tryal:* But however, they must undergo it. I say then, that granting the *Church Infallible* in the belief of *Fundamentals*, it doth not follow that we must prove *idem per idem*, as you do. For, when we ask you, Why you believe your Doctrine to be the *sole Catholick Faith*, your final Answer is, because *your Church is Infallible*; which is answering by the very *thing* in question, for you have no other way to judge of the *Catholick Faith*, but by the *Infallibility of your Church*; but when you ask us, Why we believe such an Article to be *Fundamental*; as for Instance, *That Christ will give Eternal Life to them that obey him*, we answer, not because the *Church*, which is infallible in *Fundamentals*, delivers it to be so, which were answering *idem per idem*; but we appeal to that common reason which is in Mankind, Whether, if the Doctrine of *Christ* be true, this can be other than a *Fundamental Article* of it; it being that, without which the whole design of *Christian Religion* comes to nothing. Therefore you much mistake, when you think we resolve our Faith of *Fundamentals* into the *Church* as the *infallible Witness* of them; for, though the *Church* may be *Infallible* in the belief of all things *Fundamental* (for otherwise it were not a *Church*, if it did not believe them) it doth not thence necessarily follow, That the *Church* must *infallibly witness* what is *Fundamental*, and what not. It is sufficient that the *Church* doth deliver from the consent of universal Tradition, that *infallible Rule of Faith* (which, to be sure, contains all things Fundamental in it) though she never meddle with the deciding what Points are *Fundamental*, and what not. If you therefore ask me, Why I believe any Point supposed *Fundamental*, I answer, By all the evidence which assures me, that the *Doctrine* containing that Point, is of *Divine Revelation*; If you ask me, How I know that this *Point* is part of that *Doctrine*, I appeal to the *common sense* and *reason* of the World, as to things plainly *Fundamental*, and therefore by this means your third Question is prevented, *How I know this to be the meaning of those words*; for, I suppose, no one that can tell, that two and two make four, can question but if the *Doctrine of Christ* be true, the belief of it is necessary to Salvation, which is it we mean by *Fundamental*. Either therefore prove it necessary, that the *Church* must *infallibly witness* what is *Fundamental*, and what not; and that we must rely on such a Testimony in the *belief* of *Fundamentals*, or you prove nothing at all to your

your purpose, no more than your convincing *Motives of Credibility*, which, were they made into a *grand Sallad*, would know the way to the *Table*, they are served so often up: But I have found them so dry and insipid already, I have no encouragement to venture on them any more.

§. 24. But, still you are deservedly afraid we should not think worthily enough of your Churches Infallibility. You therefore tell us very wisely, that this Infallibility is not a thing that is not infallible; *For*, say you, *Which*
P. 63. l. 50. *Infallibility must come from the Holy Ghost, and be more than humane or moral, and therefore must be truly supernatural, &c.* It is well you tell us of such a rare distinction of Infallibility; for else, I assure you, we had never thought of it, *viz.* of an *Infallibility that may be deceived*, and an *Infallibility that cannot be deceived*, or, in your words, a *humane and moral Infallibility*, and a *supernatural divine Infallibility*. To ease you therefore of your fears, I solemnly promise you, that when I believe your *Church Infallible*, I will not believe it to have a *humane, moral Infallibility*, but *supernatural and Divine*, That is, when I believe her infallible, I believe her infallible. Your mind being eased of this grand fear, you think all the difficulty is over, and that you are out of any possibility of a *Circle*; but I have endeavoured before to shew, you are not infallible in that: For the charge you exhibit against the *Bishop*, *as though you had left him tumbling in the Circle you had so easily got out of*; I shall consider it in its due time and place; but, if one may guess at being in a *Circle* by *tumbling*, you will not seem very free from it, who seem to be at very little ease by your impatience of being held to the *Subject* in hand.

Well, but yet our Conceptions must once more be rectified as to the nature of this Infallibility; before our danger was least, we should have be-
P. 64. n. 6. lieved it *to be only a humane, moral, and not supernatural Infallibility*, and now *we are bid have a care lest we think it to be any more, than in a sort, and in some manner divine*. But, what kind of transcendenral thing is this Infallibility? It is not *humane*, nor yet *divine*, and yet it is *supernatural*; which is scarce *in some sort*, or *in a manner* sense, How comes it to be *supernatural*, if it be not *divine*? Or, is it *naturally supernatural*, and *humanely divine*? It must not then be called *divine*, but, *in a manner, and after a sort: But yet*, (say you) *so far as concerns precise Infallibility, or certain Connexion with Truth, it is so truly supernatural and certain, that in this respect it yields nothing to the Scripture it self.* These are your own words: And if you did not believe *Transubstantiation*, I should think this the greatest *non-sense* in the world. But, What doth that *Infallibility* which is more than *in a sort divine*, import beyond what you assert doth belong to the Church? Is that any more than *precise Infallibility*, and *certain Connexion with Truth*, and such as is in the *Scripture*, and all this your *Church* hath, and yet, when we say so, she drops a *Courtesie*, and cries, *No, forsooth, though she be infallible*, yet she desires to be excused, *she is not infallible, but only, as if one should say in a manner, and after a sort, and so forth.* Just as if one should ask a new married Woman, Whether she were *certainly* married to such a Man, and she should answer *as to what concerns marrying, she was certainly married*, but yet she was not *absolutely married*, but only *in a manner, and after a sort.* This is so great a mystery, you will oblige the World much to inform it a little more fully in these following Questions, What kind of *Infallibility* that is which is *supernatural*, and *by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, which is equal to the Scripture it self in point of Certainty and Infal-*
P. 64. l. 46. *libility* (your own words) and yet is not *divine*, but *in a manner, and after a sort:* And what way we should come to understand *that manner and sort*, and what *degrees* and *sorts* there are in *Infallibility?* Whether any thing, so far as it is *infallible*, be not *absolutely*, as well as *precisely infallible*: And whether that which

which is but *in a ſort divine*, be not *in a ſort not divine*; Whether that which is *in a ſort not divine*, be not likewiſe in the ſame *ſort not infallible* (ſince all this Infallibility, by your own Confeſſion, is from the *Holy Ghoſt*) and whether this be not an excellent way *in a manner*, and *after a ſort*, to reconcile Contradictions. For, if a Man ſhould ask you, Whether one might be, and not be, at the ſame time; you might eaſily tell him, That *abſolutely* and *preciſely* he cannot be, and not be; but *in a manner*, and *after a ſort*, he maybe, and not be, together. You have cauſe therefore to make much of this diſtinction, and you never need fear baffling, as long as you carry it about with you; it is a moſt excellent preſervative againſt all the *batteries of ſenſe and reaſon*. But leſt yet, for all this, we ſhould apprehend ſomething by this *in a manner*, and *after a ſort*, as tho' they were ſome odd diminiſhing terms: You tell us, *No*; *Catholick Divines, by this manner of ſpeaking, do not intend to deny the Church to be equal even to Scripture it ſelf in point of Certainty and Infallibility*, What is now become of our *manner and ſort*, when the *Church* dares *juſtle* with the *Scripture* for the *upper hand*, at leaſt for an equal place as to *Infallibility*. What then is the intent of this diſtinction? *It is to ſhew the prerogatives of Scripture above the Definitions of the Church.* This doth well however to follow the reſt, it comes ſo near to a contradiction, for if the *Church* be equal to *Scripture* in point of Certainty and Infallibility, what prerogative can be left to the *Scripture* above the *Church?* when that which makes it Scripture, and the Rule of Faith is only its *Certainty* and *Infallibility?* Yes, you tell us, *The Scripture doth much exceed the Church in regard of its larger extent of Truth: becauſe there not only every reaſon, but every word and tittle is matter of Faith; but in the Definitions of the Church, neither the arguments, reaſons, nor words, are abſolutely ſpeaking matters of Faith, but only the thing declared to be ſuch.* Excellent good ſtill, and all of a piece! I commend you, that you would not offer to mix any thing of *ſenſe* in ſo good a diſcourſe: For 1. How comes the *Scripture* to have a larger *extent* of *Truth*, than the *Church*, if we cannot know what *Truth* is in the *Scripture*, but from the *Church?* 2. How *every word and tittle* comes to be *matter of Faith in Scripture*, and not in the *Church*, when you ſay, The *Church* is equal to the *Scripture* in point of *Certainty and Infallibility?* 3. How any *word and tittle* can be any where a *matter* of *Faith?* I had thought, it had been the *ſenſe* and *thing* underſtood by thoſe *words*, had been *matters of Faith*; and then it is all one with the *Scripture* and *Church*; for you ſay, as to the *Church*, the thing declared is a *matter of Faith?* 4. What that thing is, which is declared by the *Church*, which is neither *arguments, reaſons nor words*; and if it doth conſiſt of theſe, how one can be believed, and not the other: Doth your *Church* declare things ſo *nakedly*, as to do it *without arguments, reaſons or words? That ſhe can do it without words*, it is hard to believe, but very eaſie that ſhe can do it without *arguments or reaſons.* 5. Are Men bound to believe what ſhe ſo declares, *without arguments and reaſons* too? If they be, ſhew whence that *Obligation* comes; and when you attempt that, you endeavour to ſhew ſome *argument and reaſon* why they ſhould believe it. 6. What do you mean, that *theſe arguments, reaſons and words, are not abſolutely ſpeaking matters of Faith?* it ſhould ſeem then, that *conditionally* they may be ſo, and then ſhew the difference between them, and thoſe in *Scripture.* 7. How is it poſſible for us to aſſent to any thing as *a matter of Faith*, if we do not firſt *aſſent* to the *arguments, reaſons and words*, by which you would perſwade us to believe the thing to be declared by the *Church*, and what is declared Ibid.

declared by the *Church* is true. 8. Whether, when you say, *That in the Scripture every word and tittle is matter of Faith, at least implicitely, and*
Ibid. *necessarily to be believed by all that knew it to be a part of Scripture*; this will not equally hold as to the *Church* too, that *every word and tittle, is matter of Faith, at least implicitely, to all that know it to be a part of the Churches Definition?* And where then lies the prerogative of *Scripture* above the *Church?* Besides, you tell us, *The Church hath certain limits, and can define nothing, but what was either revealed before, or hath such connexion with it, as it may be rationally and logically deduced from it, as appertaining to the Declaration and Defence of that which was before revealed.* That herein you consult much for the honour of the *Scripture* above the *Church*, will appear when you have answered these *Queries*. 1. When the belief and sense of *Scripture* depend according to you, upon the *Churches* Testimony, Whether hath more limits, the *Church* or *Scripture?* For, whatever is in *Scripture*, must as to us have its *Authority* from the *Church*; and therefore your *Church* sets what bounds she pleases as to things revealed in Scripture. 2. Who shall be Judge, whether your *Church* define nothing but what was revealed before, when according to you, we can have no assurance as to any *Divine Revelation*, but from the *Judgment* of your *Church?* 3. When your *Church* defines things to be *matters of Faith*, which we think are not only *not logically and rationally deduced from Scripture, but plainly repugnant to it*, How can we believe that she doth not pretend to reveal something which was not *revealed* before? 4. Is that *rational and logical deduction from Scripture* sufficient to perswade any rational Man or no? If not, Why use you those terms; if it be, What need your *Churches Definition*, in a thing that is obvious to any ones reason? 5. Must we believe your *Church absolutely*, as to what is *rationally and logically deduced* from Scripture? If so, then, when she declares her own *Infallibility*, we must believe that to be *rationally deduced*, because she declares it. 6. Doth your *Church* make use of *Logick* and *Reason* in her deductions? then, Why may not every one else? unless she hath only the gift of *Logick* and *Reason*, which, I suppose, you will say, is but *in a manner, and after a sort.*

Moreover, say you, *The Church hath the receiving and interpreting Scripture for its end; and consequently is in that respect inferiour to it.* But, for *whose end* do you mean? the *Churches*, or the *Scriptures end?* If the *latter*; Shew us how any *end* of Scripture is attained by your *Churches interpretation*; if you mean the *Churches end*, I verily believe you, that your *Church* pretends to the receiving and interpreting *Scripture* for *her own ends*, and consequently, in that respect, she makes the *Scripture* inferiour to *her.*

P. 64. Here again we meet with another piece of your *Errantry*, in attempting to vindicate your Doctrine from the *enchantment* of another *contradiction. You say, You hold it necessary, that we are to believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God upon divine Authority*; and yet, you tell us, *That the Churches Authority, on which we are to believe Scriptures is but in some sort, and after a manner Divine.* This seems to have a huge resemblance to a Contradiction; or else you must say, That it is not necessary that we believe the *Scriptures* on a *simply Divine Authority*, but only on such a one as is *in some sort*, and after *a manner Divine:* For, if you make the same Authority to be *Divine absolutely* in your pretence, and only *after a sort* in your Application, you reach not the thing you promised. If there be not, as you say, *any necessity of defending the Churches Authority to be simply Divine, in answering that Question, How we know Scripture to be Scripture,*

then

then t..re can be no neceſſity of aſſerting, that we are bound to believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God upon Divine Authority?* Which yet is your aſſertion before; but yet you would fain diſtinguiſh *between that which is abſolutely infallible, and divine; the Churches Authority* (you ſay) *muſt be the former, but cannot be the latter*; when yet this Infallibility is, as you again tell us, *By the promiſed aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* Theſe are fit hedges to keep in *Cuckows*, but none elſe.

But, as you are ſtill off and on, ſometimes ſeeming to go forward, and then ſtepping back again; ſometimes anſwering, ſometimes proving, which are great arguments of a diſturbed mind, or a being in a *Labyrinth*, which you take many ſteps in, but can find no way out of, leſt you ſhould ſeem not ſufficiently to contradict your ſelf: You go about to prove, *That the Authority, teaching Scripture to be the Word of God, muſt be abſolutely infallible*; If you prove that, I will undertake to prove it muſt *be ſimply Divine:* But, let us ſee however, how irrefragably you prove it. *And the immediate Reaſon, Why the Authority teaching Scripture to be the Word of God, muſt be abſolutely infallible, is, becauſe it is an Article of Chriſtian Faith, that all thoſe Books which the Church hath defined for Canonical Scripture, are the Word of God; and ſeeing every Article of Faith muſt be revealed, or taught by Divine Authority, this alſo muſt be revealed, and conſequently no Authority leſs than Divine, is ſufficient to move us to believe it as an Article of Faith.* But 1. Is it not poſſible for you to utter ſo many words without a contradiction? Were you not juſt before diſtinguiſhing that Authority which is *Divine*, from that which is *abſolutely infallible*; and but *in a manner, and after a ſort Divine?* And yet here, that *Authority* which you call *abſolutely infallible*, in the former part of your Argument; in the laſt you explain it, *No Authority leſs than Divine*; Doth it not then follow, that an Authority *abſolutely infallible*, is an Authority *no leſs than Divine.* But to let that paſs among the reſt of his Brethren, 2. Why take you this needleſs pains to prove that which you ſay before, *You and your Adverſaries are agreed in.* 3. Suppoſing you ſhould meet with ſome who ſhould queſtion this, as it is probable you may do before we part; I think it no difficult thing to anſwer this Argument of yours, which, in ſhort, is, *Every Article of Faith muſt be believed upon Divine Authority, but that the Scriptures are the Word of God, is an Article of Faith.* To which I anſwer, If by *an Article of Faith*, you mean, that we muſt give an *undoubted aſſent* to, then I grant, that this is *an Article of Faith*, but deny, that every ſuch *Article* muſt be believed upon *Divine Authority*; if by an *Article of Faith* you mean ſomething to be believed upon *Divine Teſtimony*, then I grant, that every ſuch *Article* muſt be built on *Divine Authority*, but ſhall deſire you to prove, that that *Faith* whereby I believe *Scripture to be Scripture*, muſt be built on a *Divine Teſtimony.* For, I cannot ſee, how any, who ſay ſo, can free themſelves from a *Circle:* and of all perſons, you have the leaſt reaſon to ſay ſo; for you deny the *Churches Teſtimony* to be properly *Divine*, and withal the Argument is very eaſily retorted upon your ſelf. For, ſay you, *Whatſoever is an Article of Faith, muſt be believed on Divine Authority, but that the Church is infallible, I ſuppoſe, to you is an Article of Faith:* Name therefore what Divine Authority the belief of that is built upon? But, Do not you ſay, the belief of that is built on the *Motives of Credibility*, and, I ſuppoſe, you diſtinguiſh them from *Divine Authority*, or elſe they can do you no ſervice for avoiding the *Circle:* Either therefore deny that *your Churches Infallibility* is *an Article of Faith*, or elſe deny it to be neceſſary, that *every Article of Faith*, muſt be built on *Divine Autho-*

§. 25.

P. 65. l. 8.

rity, and then farewel your *old friends* the *Motives* of Credibility; or elſe, you ſee, how neceſſary it is for you, if you will vindicate your ſelf from contradiction, to anſwer this Argument, and when you have done ſo, you will believe I did not much dread the force of it. The reſt of that Paragraph, is a bare Repetition, the fourth or fifth time, of your Diſtin-
P. 94. n. 6. ction about the *Formal Object of Faith*, and the *infallible Aſſurance* of it; which is a thing in it ſelf ſo incongruous, and unreaſonable, that I had thoughts mean enough of you, when I met with it firſt; but have much meaner, now I meet with it ſo often, for I ſee, as pitiful a ſhift as it is, you have no other to make uſe of on all occaſions.

His Lordſhip goes on to prove that, ſince it is confeſſed between him and his Adverſary, *That we muſt be able to prove the Scriptures to be the Word of God, by ſome Authority that is abſolutely Divine; this Authority cannot be*
P. 65. *that of the Church. For the Church conſiſts of Men ſubject to errour; and all the parts being liable to miſtaking, and fallible, the whole cannot poſſibly be infallible in and of it ſelf, and privileged from being deceived in ſome things or other.* To this you anſwer, *His Lordſhip's Argument (that the whole may err, becauſe every part may err) is diſproved by himſelf, becauſe in Fundamentals he grants the whole Church cannot err, and yet that any particular Man may err even in thoſe points.* But, is it not plain, that his Lordſhips deſign is to prove, that if all the *parts are fallible*, the Authority of the *whole* cannot be *ſimply Divine?* and therefore he ſaith himſelf, that in *Fundamentals*, in which the *Univerſal Church* cannot err, her Authority is *not Divine*, becauſe the *Church* is tied to the uſe of means. You muſt therefore prove, that when every *part* is acknowledged *fallible*, the Authority of the *whole* in propounding any thing to be believed, can be *infallible* in and of it ſelf: I cannot therefore underſtand, how the perfection of Infallibility in the propoſition of any Object to be believed, can be applied to the whole Church, when every particular member of it in ſuch
P. 65. a *Propoſition* is ſuppoſed to be fallible. *The Arch-Biſhop therefore tells you, That there is ſpecial immediate Revelation requiſite to the very leaſt degree of Divine Authority*; to avoid which, *you would fain prove, that there may be abſolute Infallibility, without Divine Authority, and immediate Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, in delivering Objects of Faith, without immediate Revelation.* You tell us therefore, *Though the Church uſe means, yet ſhe receives not her Infallibility from them, but from the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, which makes her Definitions truly infallible, though they be not new Revelations.* But, How do you prove, that any thing but an *immediate Divine Revelation* can make ſuch a *Divine Teſtimony* which is ſuppoſed neceſſary for the *belief of Scripture to be Scripture?* How can you make it appear, that there can be *Infallibility* in the *Concluſion*, where there was not *Infallibility* in judging of the *Truth* of the *Premiſes?* You ſay, *By the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* But why ſhould you not believe ſuch an Aſſiſtance in the *one*, as well as the *other?* If therefore you aſſert, that the *Spirit of God* doth not aſſiſt infallibly in the *uſe of the means*, but only in the *concluſion*, then it muſt be an *immediate Revelation*; for what elſe it ſhould be, is not intelligible. For, I had thought the *Revelation* had been *immediate*, when ſomewhat more was diſcovered than all *uſe of means* could attain to: therefore the Churches *Infallibility* muſt be a meer *Enthuſiaſm.* No, ſay you, *Becauſe it only declares what was formerly revealed.* Though that be a Queſtion among ſome of your ſelves; yet, ſuppoſing it to be ſo, it clears not the Buſineſs. For, ſuppoſe that *God* had *ſupernaturally aſſiſted* the *Underſtanding* of any *Prophet* in declaring a Prophecy which had been revealed before, Would

not

not this have been as immediate a *Revelation* to that *Prophet*, as if it had been a *new Prophecy?* And the case is the same here; for, though you say, the *Material Objects of Faith* be revealed before, yet we cannot know the *Formal Object of Faith*, without your *Churches* Declaration, so that on your Principles there cannot lie an Obligation to Faith on us, without your *Churches Definition*; and therefore that is as necessary *to us*, as immediate Revelation; and to the *Church it self*, when you say, *The Infallibility proceeds so immediately from God, that if the Church should fall into error, that would be ascribed to God as much as in case of Divine Revelation*, What difference can you make between them? For, it is not, Whether the *Object* be new or old, which makes an *immediate Revelation*; but the *immediate Impression* of it on the Understanding. For if the *Spirit of God* doth immediately discover to any one, a thing knowable by natural causes, is it any thing the less an immediate Divine Revelation? So it must be in things already revealed, if the same *things* be discovered in an *immediate infallible manner* to the mind of any, the Revelation is as immediate as if they had never been revealed before.

Your last *Paragraph* affords us still more evidence of your *self-contradicting* Faculty; for which we need no more than lay your words together. Your words next before were, *If the Church should fall into error, it would be as much ascribed to God himself, as in case of immediate Divine Revelation*; but here you add; *Neither is it necessary for us to affirm, that the Definition of the Church, is God's immediate Revelation*; *as, if the Definition were false, God's Revelation must be also such: It is enough for us to averr, that God's Promise would be infringed, as truly it would in that Supposition.* From which we may learn very useful Instructions. 1. That *God's Promise* may be *infringed*, and yet *God's Revelation* not proved to be *false*: But whence came that Promise? Was it not a *Divine Revelation?* If it was undoubtedly such, Can such a Promise be false, and not *God's Revelation?* 2. That though if the *Church err*, *God* must be *fallible*, yet for all this, all *God's Revelations* may remain *infallible.* 3. That though the only ground of *Infallibility be the immediate Assistance of the Holy Ghost*, which gives as great an *Infallibility*, as ever was in *Prophets* and *Apostles*; yet we must not say, That such an Infallibility doth suppose an *immediate Revelation.* 4. That though *God's Veracity* would be destroyed, if the *Church* should define any thing for a point of *Catholick Faith*, which were not revealed from *God*, which are your next words; yet we are not to think, if her Definition be false, *God's Revelation* must be also such, which are your words foregoing. Those are excellent *Corollaries* to conclude so profound a Discourse with. And, *if the Bishop* (as you say) *had little reason to accuse you for maintaining a Party*; I am sure, I have less to admire you, for *your seeking Truth*; *and whatever Animosity you are led by*, I hope I have made it evident, *you are led by very little Reason.*

CHAP. VI.

Of the Infallibility of Tradition.

Of the unwritten Word, and the neceſſary Ingredients of it. The Inſtances for it particularly examined and diſproved. The Fathers Rule for examining Traditions. No unwritten Word the Foundation of Divine Faith. In what ſenſe Faith may be ſaid to be Divine. Of Tradition being known by its own Light, and the Canon of the Scripture. The Teſtimony of the Spirit, how far pertinent to this Controverſie. Of the uſe of Reaſon in the Reſolution of Faith. T. C.*'s Dialogue anſwered, with another between himſelf and a Sceptick. A twofold Reſolution of Faith into the Doctrine, and into the Books. Several Objections anſwered from the Suppoſition of a Child brought up without ſight of Scripture. Chriſt no Ignoramus nor Impoſtor though the Church be not Infallible.* T. C.*'s Blaſphemy in ſaying otherwiſe. The Teſtimonies of* Irenæus *and St.* Auguſtine *examined and retorted. Of the nature of infallible Certainty, as to the Canon of Scripture; and whereon it is grounded. The Teſtimonies produced by his Lordſhip vindicated.*

§. 1. YOU begin this *Chapter* with as much confidence, as if you had ſpoken nothing but *Oracles* in the foregoing. *Whether the Biſhop or you were more hardly put to it*, let any indifferent Reader judge: If he did, as you ſay, *tread on the brink of a Circle*; we have made it appear, notwithſtanding all your Evaſions, that you are left in the middle of it. The reaſon of his falling on the unwritten Word, *is not his fear of ſtooping to the Church, to ſhew it him, and finally depend on her Authority*; but to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of your Proceedings, who talk much of an unwritten Word, and are not able to prove any ſuch thing. *If he will not believe any unwritten Word, but what is ſhewn him deliver'd by the Prophets and Apoſtles*, I think he hath a great deal of reaſon for ſuch Incredulity, unleſs you could ſhew him ſome aſſurance of any unwritten Word, that did not come from the *Apoſtles*. Though he deſired *not to read unwritten Words in their Books*, which is a wiſe Queſtion you ask; yet he reaſonably requeſted ſome certain evidence of what you pretend to be ſo, that he might not have ſo big a Faith as to ſwallow into his belief, that every thing which his Adverſary ſays is the *unwritten Word*, is ſo indeed. *If it be not your deſire he ſhould*, we have the greater hopes of ſatisfaction from you; but if you crave *the indifferent Reader's Patience, till he hear Reaſon from you*, I am afraid his Patience will be tired before you come to it. But, whatever it is, it muſt be examined.

Though your Diſcourſe concerning this *unwritten Word*, be as the reſt are, very confuſed and immethodical, yet I conceive the deſign and ſubſtance of it lies in theſe particulars, as will appear in the examination of them.

1. That there is an unwritten Word, which muſt be believed by us, containing ſuch Doctrinal Traditions, as are warranted by the *Church* for *Apoſtolical*.

2. That the ground of believing this unwritten Word, is from the Infallibility of the *Church*, which defines it to be ſo.

3. That our belief of the *Scriptures* muſt be grounded on ſuch an unwritten Word, which is warranted by the Church: Under each of theſe I ſhall examine faithfully what belongs to them in your indigeſted Diſcourſe.

The

The first of these is taken from your own words; where you tell us, *That our Ensurancer in the main Principle of Faith concerning the Scriptures being the Word of God, is Apostolical Tradition; and well may it be so, for such Tradition declared by the Church, is the unwritten Word of God.* And you after tell us, *That every Doctrine, which any particular Person may please to call Tradition, is not therefore to be received as God's unwritten Word, but such Doctrinal Traditions only, as are warranted to us by the Church for truly Apostolical, which are consequently God's unwritten Word.* So that these three things are necessary ingredients of this unwritten Word. 1. That it must be *originally Apostolical*, and not only so, but it must be of *Divine Revelation to the Apostles* too. For otherwise it cannot be *God's Word* at all, and therefore not his *unwritten Word.* I quarrel not at all with you for speaking of an *unwritten Word*, if you could prove it; for it is evident to me, that *God's Word* is no more so, by being written or printed, that if it were not so: For the writing adds no Authority to the *Word*, but only is a more certain means of conveying it to us. It is therefore *God's Word*, as it proceeds from him; and that which is now his *written Word*, was once his *unwritten Word*: But however, whatever is *God's Word*, must come from him, and since you derive the source of the *unwritten Word* from the *Apostles*, whatever you call an *unwritten Word*, you must be sure to derive its pedigree down from them. So that insisting of that point of time, when this was declared and owned for an *unwritten Word*, you must be able to shew, that it came from the *Apostles*, otherwise it cannot be owned as an *Apostolical Tradition.* 2. That what you call an *unwritten Word*, must be something *Doctrinal*; so you call *them* your self *Doctrinal Traditions*, *i. e.* such as contain in them somewhat *dogmatical* or necessary to be believed by us: And thence it was, this Controversie rose from the Dispute concerning the sufficiency of the *Scriptures*, as a *Rule of Faith*, Whether that contained all *God's Word*, or all matters to be believed or no; or, Whether there were not some Objects of Faith, which were never written, but conveyed by Tradition? That what is thus *Doctrinal*, must be declared by the Church to be an *Apostolical Tradition*; which you in terms assert.

P. 66. ch. 6. n. 1.

According then to these Rules we come to examine the Evidences by you produced for such an *unwritten Word.* For which, you first produce several Instances out of St. *Austin*, *of such things which were in his time judged to be such*, i. e. *Doctrinal Traditions derived from the Apostles, and have ever since been conserved and esteemed such in the whole Church of Christ.* The first you instance in, is that we now treat of, *That Scripture is the Word of God*, for which you propose the known place wherein he affirms *he should not belive the Gospel, but for the Authority of the Church moving him thereto.* But this proves nothing to your purpose, unless you make it appear, that the *Authority of the Church* could not move him *to believe the Gospel*, unless that Authority be supposed to be an *unwritten Word.* For, I will suppose, that St. *Austin*, or any other rational Man might be sufficiently induced to believe the *Gospel*, on the account of the *Churches* Authority, not as delivering any *Doctrinal Tradition* in the nature of an unwritten *Word*, but as attesting that *Universal Tradition*, which had been among all *Christians* concerning it. Which universal Tradition is nothing else but a conveying down to us the judgment of *Sense and Reason* in the present case. For the Primitive *Christians* being best able to judge as to what Authentick Writings came from the *Apostles*, not by any unwritten Word, but by the use of all moral means, it cannot reasonably be supposed, that the successive Christians should imbezzle these Authentick Records, and substitute others

§. 2.

C. ep. fund. c. 5.

others in the place of them. When therefore *Manichæus* pretended the Authenticalneſs of ſome other Writings, beſides thoſe then owned by the *Church*, St. *Auſtin* did no more than any reaſonable Man would do in the like caſe, *viz.* appeal to the *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Catholick Church*; upon the account of which, he ſays, He was induced to believe the Goſpel it ſelf, *i. e.* not ſo much the *Doctrine*, as the *Books* containing it. But of this more largely elſewhere. I can hardly excuſe you from a Falſification of St. *Auſtin*'s meaning, in the enſuing words, which you thus render: *If any clear Teſtimony were brought out of Scripture againſt the Church, he would neither believe the Scripture, nor the Church*; whereas it appears by the words cited in your own Margin, his meaning is only this, *If you can find,* (ſaith he) *ſomething very plain in the Goſpel concerning the Apoſtleſhip of* Manichæus, *you will thereby weaken the Authority of thoſe Catholicks, who bid me, that I ſhould not believe you; whoſe Authority being weakned, neither can I believe the Goſpel, becauſe, through them, I believed it.* Is here any thing like what you ſaid, or at leaſt would ſeem to have apprehended to be his meaning? Which is plainly this. *If againſt the conſent of all thoſe Copies which the Catholick Chriſtians received, thoſe Copies ſhould be found truer, which have in them ſomething of the Apoſtleſhip of* Manichæus; *this muſt needs weaken much the Authority of the Catholick Church in its Tradition, whom he adhered to againſt the* Manichees; *and their Authority being thus weakned, his Faith, as to the Scriptures delivered by them, muſt needs be much weakned too.* To give you an Inſtance of a like nature; The *Mahometans* pretend, that in the Scripture there was anciently expreſs mention of their Prophet *Mahomet*, but that the *Chriſtians*, out of hatred of their Religion, have eraſed all thoſe places which ſpake of him: Suppoſe now, a *Chriſtian* ſhould ſay, If he ſhould find in the *Goſpel* expreſs mention of *Mahomet*'s being a Prophet, it would much weaken the Authority of the whole *Chriſtian Church*; which being ſo weakned, it muſt of neceſſity weaken the Faith of all thoſe who have believed our preſent Copies Authentick, upon the account of the Chriſtian Churches Authority. Is not this plainly the caſe St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of; and, Is it any more than any Man's Reaſon will tell him? Not that the Churches Authority is to be relied on as judicially or infallibly, but as rationally, delivering ſuch an Univerſal Tradition to us. And, might not St. *Auſtin*, on the ſame reaſon, *as well believe the Acts of the Apoſtles as the Goſpel*, when they were both equally delivered by the ſame univerſal Tradition? What you have gained then to your purpoſe from theſe three Citations out of St. *Auſtin*, in your firſt Inſtance, I cannot eaſily imagine.

Ibid.

§. 3. Your ſecond Tradition is, That the Father is not begotten of any other Perſon. St. *Auſtin*'s words are, *Sicut Patrem in illis libris nuſquam Ingenitum legimus, & tamen dicendum eſſe defenditur. We never read in the Scriptures, that the Father is unbegotten; and yet it is defended, that we muſt ſay ſo.* And had they not good reaſon with them to ſay ſo, who believed that he was the *Father* by way of excluſion of ſuch a kind of *Generation* as the Eternal *Son* of *God* is ſuppoſed to have? But, Muſt this be an Inſtance of a Doctrinal Tradition, containing ſome *Object* of *Faith* diſtinct from Scripture? Could any one, whoever believed the Doctrine of the *Trinity* as revealed in Scripture, believe or imagine any other; That though it be not in expreſs terms ſet down in Scripture, yet no one that hath any conceptions of the Father, but this is implied in them. If it be therefore a Tradition, becauſe it is not expreſly in Scripture, Why may not *Trinity*, *Hypoſtaſis*, *Perſon*, *Conſubſtantiality*, be all *unwritten Traditions* as well as this? You will ſay, Becauſe,

Tom. 2. ep. 114.

cause, tho' the words be not there, yet the sense is: and I pray, take the same Answer for this of the *Fathers being unbegotten.*

Your third is, *Of the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin* Mary: This indeed, S. *Austin* saith is to be believed *fide integra*, but he saith not, *divinâ*, but, Do you therefore make this a *Doctrinal Tradition*, and an *unwritten Word?* If you make it a *doctrinal Tradition*, you must shew us, what *Article of Faith* is contained in it. That it was not looked on as an *unwritten Word*, will appear by the disputations of those *Fathers*, who writ most eagerly about it, who make it their design to prove it out of *Scripture.* Those who did most zealously appear against the Opinion of *Helvidius*, were S. *Hierom*, and S. *Ambrose*, of the *Latin Church.* S. *Austin* only mentions it in the places by you cited: Of the *Greek Church Epiphanius*, and S. *Basil.* And yet every one of these contends to have it proved out of Scripture. S. *Hierom* enters his dispute against *Helvidius* upon those terms of confuting him out of *Scripture*; and towards the conclusion of that discourse, see what a friend S. *Hierom* is to *doctrinal Traditions. As*, saith he, *we deny not the things which are written, so we embrace not the things which are not written. We believe the Incarnation, because we read it; we believe not the Marriage of* Mary *after her delivery, because we read it not.* S. *Ambrose*, in his Epistle to *Theophilus* and *Anysius*, where he first mentions this Opinion, argues against it wholly from the *Testimony of Scripture*; and the unreasonableness of the thing. To the same purpose *Epiphanius* discourseth of this subject, whose utmost Arguments are only probabilities; Whether the *Antidicomariani* were the same with *Helvidians*, as S. *Austin* supposeth: Or, Whether they were the Disciples of *Apollinarius*, who broached the same Doctrine in the *East*, at the time *Helvidius* did in the *West*, as others suppose, is not material to our purpose, but this latter seems to be the Opinion of *Epiphanius*: Who in his Epistle, written in Confutation of that Opinion, chargeth the first Authors of it with great Ignorance of the Scriptures, and urgeth many places to prove the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*, and therefore did not look on it as an unwritten Word. S. *Basil* in his discourse concerning *the Humane Generation of Christ*, falls upon this Subject, and goes about to prove it from the importance of ἕως οὗ, *which* (saith he) *although it seems to speak some circumscription of time, yet it really denotes* τὸ ἀόριστον, *an indefinite time, as in that, I will be with you always to the end of the world.* But he ushers in this discourse with this remarkable Expression; *Although this be no hindrance to the Doctrine of Piety; for till the Oeconomy of her delivery was accomplished, her Virginity was necessary; but what became of it afterwards is not pertinent to this mystery: however, because the ears of those who love Christ, will hardly entertain this, that* Mary *ceased to be a Virgin, we suppose these proofs sufficient for it.* Judge then whether St. *Basil* did believe this to be a Doctrine of Faith, or an unwritten word. This Testimony *Fronto Ducæus*, is much troubled with, and would go about to prove this to be an Article of Faith, from the *Councils of Constantinople and the Lateran*; in the first of which she is only called ἀεὶ παρθένος. But doth that note it to be an Article of Faith? As for his evasion of this Testimony, it is so impertinent, that I shall

Ipsa Scripturarum verba ponenda sunt ut ipsis quibus adversum nos usus est testimoniis revincatur. Advers. Helv. prim.

Sed ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus: Natum Deum esse de Virgine credimus, quia legimus; Mariam nupsisse post partum, non credimus quia non legimus. Hieron. advers. Helv. To. 2. p. 6. col. 1. ed. P. 1533.

V. Ambros. Tom. 3. ep. 9. Basil. 1555.

Epiphan. hæres. 78. To. 1. l. 3. ed. Petav.

Aug. de hæres. 84.

V. Vasquez in 3. *p. Thom. tom.* 2. *disp.* 121. *c.* 6.

Epiph. hæres. 78. *sect.* 7. *p.* 1038.

Homil. 25. *p.* 509. *Tom.* 1.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ εἰ καὶ μηδὲ τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλυμαίνεται λόγῳ (μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρεσίας ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθενία, τὸ δὲ ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμόνητον τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου καταλείψομεν) ὅμως διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοὴν, ὅτί ποτε ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἡ θεοτόκος, ἐκείνας ἡγούμεθα τὰς μαρτυρίας αὐτάρκεις. Ibid.

Not. in Basil. Tom. 3. *p.* 49. *ed. Par.* 1638.

ſhall not repeat it, although he voucheth *Vaſquez* for the Author of it. It cannot be denied, but that afterwards S. *Baſil* produceth a Tradition for it concerning *Zachary*'s placing the *Virgin Mary* after her delivery, among the *Virgins*, for which he was ſlain of the *Jews*, between the Temple and the Altar. But, we may gueſs at the credit of this Tradition, by what S. *Hierom* ſaith of it, that it came *ex Apocryphorum ſomniis*, and withal, gives a ſufficient laſh at all Traditions, by reaſon of this, in the next words. *Hoc quia de Scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eâdem facilitate contemnitur, quâ probatur. Which having no Authority from the Scriptures, it is as eaſily contemned as produced.* And think you not then, that S. *Hierom* was a great friend to your doctrinal Traditions, and unwritten Word? But, ſay you ſtill, *The Virginity of* Mary *muſt be an Article of Faith, becauſe, thoſe who denied it are called Hereticks*; *and S.* Auguſtine *calls* Helvidius *his Opinion, blaſphemy.* But, though *Helvidius* be liſted among the *Hereticks*, yet, I ſuppoſe, you will not ſay that all who are liſted in thoſe *Catalogues* are defined to be *Hereticks* by the *Catholick Church?* It is very apparent, that any one who ſeemed to broach any new fancies, and thereby diſturbed the *Churches Peace*, were called *Hereticks* by them. And *Vaſquez* confeſſeth that *Aquinas* calls it an *Error*, and not an *Hereſie* in *Helvidius*. If it were ſo, he was not the firſt Author of it; for, *Tertullian* is not only cited by *Helvidius* for it, and S. *Hierom* caſts away his Teſtimony, as of a Man out of the *Church*, but *Vaſquez* confeſſeth he delivers it ſo often, that *Pamelius* could make no *antidote* for thoſe places. One would therefore think, that one ſo near the *Apoſtles* as *Tertullian* was, might eaſily have learned ſuch a Tradition, and ſo great a friend to *Virginity* as he was (while a *Montaniſt*) ſhould not have been apt to believe the contrary. That which was accounted *Blaſphemy* in *Helvidius*, was the raſhneſs of his aſſertion, which ſeemed diſhonourable to the *Bleſſed Virgin*, and not as though he did thereby overthrow any Article of Faith. For the other part of your Tradition, that ſhe was a *Virgin* in the *Birth* of *Chriſt*, you will find it a greater difficulty to make it out to have been believed as a *Tradition*, much leſs as an unwritten Word. For not only *Tertullian*, but *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Epiphanius*, *Ambroſe*, *Theophylact* oppoſe you in it; and judge you then, whether this were owned as a conſtant Tradition or no. But it is not worth while to inſiſt upon it

Comment. in Matth. 23. Tom. 9.

Ubi ſupra.

In 3. p. Tho. tom. 2. q. 28. art. 3.

cap. 7.

§. 4. Your fourth Inſtance is, concerning *the Rebaptization of Hereticks.* Concerning which, two things are to be conſidered, *The Cuſtom it ſelf*, and the *Right* and *Law* on which that Cuſtom was grounded. In the places by you cited out of S. *Auſtin*, it is plain, he ſpeaks of the Cuſtom, and Practice of the *Church*, which (ſaith he) did not uſe the *Iteration of Baptiſm, which Cuſtom, he believed, did come from Apoſtolical Tradition*; *as many other things which are not found in the writings of the Apoſtles, nor in following Councils, yet becauſe they are obſerved by the Univerſal Church, are believed to be delivered, and commended by them.* To the ſame purpoſe is the other Teſtimony. But what is this to *doctrinal Traditions, concerning matters of Faith?* That there were many *Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtoms* obſerved in the *Church* as *Apoſtolical Traditions*, I deny not, but that is not our preſent Queſtion. If you therefore enquire into that which is only *doctrinal* in this caſe concerning the *right* and lawfulneſs of Practice in this caſe, that he fixeth wholly upon the Scriptures. The Practice of the *Church* in admitting *Hereticks* without baptizing them again, might be known by *Tradition*, but whether the Church did well or ill in it, muſt be by

Contra Donatiſt. l. 2. c. 7.

S. *Auſtin*'s

S. *Auſtin*'s own confeſſion determined out of *Scripture*. And in that latter place by you cited, there is mentioned no ſuch thing as an unwritten word, or that the *Apoſtles* had left any command that *Hereticks* ſhould not be baptized again. *Nihil quidem exinde præceperunt Apoſtoli*, are his own words: there being then neither written nor unwritten *Word* for it, S. *Auſtin* takes the likelieſt courſe he could think of, which was, from the Cuſtom of the *Church*, to judge moſt probably what was moſt agreeable to the *Apoſtles* minds. But ſtill, when he comes to urge moſt home againſt the *Donatiſts*, he makes his recourſe to the *Scriptures*. And offers to prove the *matter in diſpute from them, and would have all tryed by the Balance of the Lord*: And expreſly ſaith, *It is againſt the Lords command, that thoſe who have had lawful Baptiſm already, ſhould be rebaptized*. So that we ſee, S. *Auguſtine* did not himſelf think it a ſufficient proof of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, that it was a Cuſtom of the *Church*, unleſs he did likewiſe produce certain evidence out of *Scripture* for the confirmation of it. Neither then will your fourth Inſtance prove what it was brought for.

Ex Evangelio profero certa documenta. l. 1. c. Donatiſt. cap. 6.

Quid ſit perniciöſius, utrum non baptizari an rebaptizari, judicare difficile eſt, veruntamen recurrens ad illam ſtateram Dominicam, ubi non ex humano ſenſu ſed ex divinâ auctoritate rerum momenta penſantur, invenio de utrâque re Domini ſententiam, nempe in Scripturis. l. 2. c. 14. Huc accedit quia benè perſpectis ex utroque latere diſputationis rationibus, & Scripturarum Teſtimoniis, poteſt etiam dici, Quod veritas declaravit hoc ſequimur. l. 4. c. 7. vid. l. 4. c. 24. l. 5. c. 4. l. 6. c. 1. l. 5. c. 23. c. 26.

Your fifth concerning *Infants Baptiſm*, you have given us occaſion to conſider largely already; your ſixth depends upon that; your ſeventh is only a rite of the Church. To your eighth I anſwer, Tho' the Tradition of the Church be a great confirmation of the *Apoſtolical Practice* in obſervation of the *Lords day*, yet that very Practice, and the ground of it, are ſufficiently deduced from *Scripture*. Among all theſe Inſtances therefore, we are yet to ſeek for ſuch a *doctrinal Tradition*, as makes an *unwritten Word*. But, methinks an Author, who would ſeem ſo much verſed in S. *Auguſtine*, might, among all theſe Inſtances, have found out one more, which would have looked more like a *doctrinal Tradition*, than moſt of theſe, which is, the *neceſſity of the Euchariſt to baptized Infants*: The places are ſo many, and ſo expreſs in him concerning it, that it would be a needleſs task to produce them. I ſhall only therefore refer you to your *Eſpencæus*, who hath made ſome collection of them. When you have viewed them, I pray bethink your ſelf of ſome convenient Anſwer to them, which either muſt be by aſſerting, that S. *Auguſtine* might be deceived in judging of *Doctrinal* and *Apoſtolical Traditions*; and then to what purpoſe are your eight Inſtances out of him? Or elſe that might be accounted an *Apoſtolical Tradition* in one *age*, which may not in another; and then, ſince, according to your judgment, the *preſent Church is infallible in every age*, that was *infallibly* an *Apoſtolical Tradition* in one age, which infallibly is *not ſo* in another. Which leaves us in a greater diſpute than ever, what theſe *Apoſtolical Traditions* are, when the *Church* in ſeveral ages doth ſo much differ concerning them.

Eſpenc. de Euchariſt. ad Orat. l. 2. c. 12.

After you have, in your way, attempted to prove ſuch *unwritten Words*, or *doctrinal Traditions*, you fall upon a high charge againſt his Lordſhip, and not without a ſevere reflection on all *Proteſtants*, in theſe words. *It is ſo natural to Proteſtants to build upon falſe grounds, that they cannot enter into a Queſtion, without ſuppoſing a falſhood; ſo his Lordſhip here feeds his humour, and obtrudes many.* It is well yet his Lordſhip meets with no worſe entertainment than all *Proteſtants* do: You think all *Proteſtants* ſtill build upon falſe grounds, becauſe not *ſupra hanc Petram*, and that they ſtill ſuppoſe falſhoods, becauſe they ſuppoſe your *Church fallible*, whether ſhe under-

§. 5.

P. 68.

takes to explain written, or define unwritten Words. But, whether his Lordſhip feeds his humour in obtruding falſhoods, or you yours in calumniating, will appear upon examination. You ſay, *He makes* Bellarmine, *and all Catholick Doctors, maintain, that whatever they pleaſe to call Tradition, muſt preſently be received by all as God's unwritten Word.* Upon which you go about to vindicate *Bellarmine*, by repeating his diſtinctions concerning Traditions, *viz. That ſome are Divine, others Apoſtolical, and others Eccleſiaſtical, and that ſome belong to Faith, others to Manners.* But all this doth not ſerve your turn. For 1. His Lordſhip doth not deny, that *Bellarmine* uſeth theſe diſtinctions, but reduceth all theſe ſeveral Traditions under the ſame common title *de Verbo Dei non ſcripto*; and that his deſign therein, is to impoſe upon unwary Readers, that all the Traditions mentioned by him, are *God's unwritten Word.* Upon which, his Lordſhip had good reaſon to go about to undeceive them, and to make it appear ſo evidently as he hath done, that *Tradition*, and *God's unwritten Word*, are not convertible terms; both becauſe there may be juſtly ſuppoſed to have been many *unwritten Words*, which were never delivered over to the *Church*; and that there are many things which go for *Traditions* in your *Church*, which have no ſhadow of pretence from an *unwritten Word.* 2. There may be yet further cunning in all this; for although *Bellarmine* and you diſtinguiſh of *Traditions, Divine, Apoſtolical and Eccleſiaſtical*; yet when you come to put the difference between theſe, I ſuppoſe you would not leave it to every particular *perſon*, to judge which of theſe *Traditions* is of theſe ſeveral natures, but the *Church* muſt be judge of them. So that a Tradition is *Eccleſiaſtical*, when your *Church* will have it ſo, that is, when it is diſuſed among you, as the *three dippings in Baptiſm*, the *participation of Euchariſts by Infants*, &c. But when any Tradition is ſtill in *uſe* by your *Church*, then your *Churches Practice* being in this caſe a ſufficient Definition as to all thoſe things ſo uſed by your *Church*, they muſt be accounted *Apoſtolical*, if not *Divine.* 3. Of what kind or nature ſoever theſe *Traditions* are ſuppoſed to be, whether *Divine*, *Apoſtolical*, or *Eccleſiaſtical*, prove any of them to contain any thing *neceſſary for Faith* and *Salvation*, and you will then come near an *unwritten Word.* Your *Eccleſiaſtical Traditions* diſcard your ſelf from being ſuch, inform us then what *Divine* and *Apoſtolical Traditions* thoſe are which are founded on ſuch an unwritten Word? Whether any of your *Eccleſiaſtical Traditions* contradict *God's Word*, or no, is not here a place to examine; we are now enquiring, whether there be any ſuch thing as an *unwritten Word* at all, which contains any matter neceſſary for us to believe, or practiſe. The only pretence you have here for it, is, *That we believe by Divine Faith, that Scripture is God's Word, and that there is no other Word of God to aſſure us of this Point, but the Tradition delivered to us by the Church, and that ſuch Tradition ſo delivered, muſt be the unwritten Word of God.* How far we are to believe *Scriptures* to be the *Word of God*, with *Divine Faith*, will be throughly examined in its due time; and likewiſe how far any *Word of God* is neceſſary for the Foundation of this *Faith*: only I cannot here but take notice, what it is which makes a Tradition be the *unwritten Word of God*; and what becomes then of your former diſtinction concerning *Traditions*? for we ſee, that which makes them the *Word of God*, is their being delivered by the *Church*; ſo that let their Author, Nature, or Matter be what it will, according to this Principle any *Tradition* being delivered by your *Church*, becomes an *unwritten Word.* So I come to the ſecond Propoſition,

2. *That*

2. *That the ground of believing any unwritten Word, is the Infallibility of your Church defining it to be so.* For you say, *As the Church was Infallible in defining what was written, so is she also Infallible in defining what was not written. And so she came neither* tradere non traditum, *nor can she be unfaithful to God, in not faithfully keeping the* depositum *committed to her trust: Neither can her Sons ever justly accuse her of the contrary, but are bound to believe her Tradition, because she being Infallible, the Tradition she delivers can never be against the Word of their Father.* The substance of all which, is that which I laid down as your Proposition, *That the ground of believing any Tradition to be Apostolical, or any unwritten Word, is your Churches Infallibility in defining it to be so.* Which being built on a Principle, I have already manifested to be so fallacious and uncertain, I might without further trouble, quit my hands of it: But I shall, however, shew how inconsistent this is with the Rules of the *Ancients*, for discerning when *Traditions* are *Apostolical*, and when not. The great Rule we meet with among the Ancients for judging *Apostolical* Traditions, is that of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *In ipsâ item Catholicâ Ecclesiâ magnoperè curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est: hoc est enim verè proprieque Catholicum.* If this be a certain Rule to judge of *Catholick* and *Apostolical Traditions by*, viz. *That which hath been held every where, always, and by all*; then the judgment of *your Church* cannot be the infallible definer of *Apostolical Traditions*, unless you will suppose that your *Church* only can tell us, what was held *every where, always, and by all:* And if your *Church* alone can infallibly determine what Traditions are *Apostolical*, to what purpose should we be put to such a *Wild-goose chase*, to enquire *Universality*, *Antiquity* and *Consent* in all things which pretend to be Traditions? But to any reasonable Man, as to any thing which pretends to be a matter necessary to be believed or practised, which is not expressly revealed in *Scripture*; this Rule of *Vincentius* seems very just and equitable, that before we believe it necessary, it be made appear, that it was universally believed by *Christians* to be so, and that in all Ages. And I assure you, I am so far convinced of the reasonableness of this Proposal, that if you will make out any of those things controverted between us, such as *Invocation of Saints*, *Worship of Images*, *Transubstantiation*, *Adoration of the Eucharist*, *Purgatory*, *Indulgences*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, &c. by these Rules, and make it appear to me, that these were held by all *Christian Churches*, *at all times*, or have *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*; I shall be very inclinable to embrace what your *Church* would impose upon me. But when I know how impossible a task this is, I do not at all wonder that you should quit this formerly magnified saying of *Vincentius*, and resolve all into the Infallibility of the present *Church*. But hereby we see, how far you are from the judgment of *Antiquity*, as to this very point of the tryal of *doctrinal Traditions*, since you can see no security any where but in your selves, and your *Churches Infallibility*; I will therefore reduce the Controversie yet shorter: Prove but this *Infallibility of your Church in defining the written and underwritten Word* by these Rules of *Vincentius*, *Universality*, *Antiquity and Consent*, and I will yield you all the rest. But what unreasonable Men are you, if you must be Parties and Judges too; or if we must believe an *unwritten Word*, because your *Church* is *Infallible*; and believe your *Church Infallible*, because that is an *unwritten Word?* And well may you call it so; for, search the whole Book of *Scriptures*, and all the Records of the Primitive *Church*, and you find nothing at all of it. We see plainly then, you are resolved to be tryed by none but your selves, and

§. 6. P. 68. n. 2.

Commonit. c. 3.

ſo you are *Catholicks*, becauſe you ſay, You are ſo; and, your *Church Infallible*, becauſe ſhe pretends to be ſo.

§ 7. 3. *That our belief of the Scriptures muſt be reſolved into an unwritten Word, which is defined by your Church to be ſuch.* This is that, for whoſe ſake all your other diſcourſe is brought in, and is the main thing to the purpoſe, Although you pretend likewiſe to a power in your *Church*, to declare *what Chriſt ſaid when he held his peace.* (But, are you ſure your *Church* will be infallible in that too?) For when his *Lordſhip* had ſaid, *That where-ever Chriſt held his peace, and that his words are not regiſtred, no Man may dare*
P. 68. *without raſhneſs, to ſay, They were theſe or theſe:* You very gravely add, *That his Lordſhip muſt give you leave to tell him, you muſt bind up his whole aſſertion with this* Proviſo, *but according as the Church ſhall declare.* Your *Church* then muſt declare when *Chriſt* held his peace, and when he did not; when he ſpake ſo, that others might hear him, and when he did not; when any thing was taken notice of that he ſaid, and when not. But when it is apparent Chriſt both ſpake, and did much more than ever was written, how well doth your Church acquit her Office in being *Chriſt's Remembrancer?* And therefore I believe your Church will be guilty of the ſame raſhneſs with any private Perſon in St. *Auguſtine's Opinion, In offering to determine what Chriſt ſaid when either he held his peace, or his words are not*
P. 69. *regiſtred.* As for thoſe things which you mention *for Traditions, not contrary to God's written Word, which yet are not an unwritten Word, ſuch as the Ceremonies of Baptiſm* by you mentioned, they are therefore not pertinent to our purpoſe, becauſe they are only Rites and Ceremonies, and our diſcourſe is about *Doctrinal Traditions*; neither yet if I would ſpend time in the enquiry, could you derive them from *Apoſtolical Tradition*, notwithſtanding what either you, or *Bellarmine* ſay. But the ſubſtance of all you have to ſay, pertinent to your purpoſe, is, *That though every Tradition be not God's unwritten Word, yet it being neceſſary for us to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, we muſt believe it either for ſome word written or unwritten, or we ſhall have no Divine Faith at all of the Point, becauſe all Divine Faith muſt rely upon ſome Word of God.* This being a great novelty with you, that is, ſomething like Argumentation, it obliges me to take a little more particular notice of it. Any one that conſiders the force of this Argument, will find, that it lies wholly upon your notion of *Divine Faith:* For it appearing unreaſonable to you, that our belief that the Scripture is the Word, ſhould be reſolved into the written Word it ſelf; therefore you find out an *unwritten Word of God* for a *Divine Faith* to fix it ſelf upon, which can be nothing but *ſome Word of God.* To this therefore I anſwer, that when you ſay, It is neceſſary *we muſt believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God with Divine Faith*, this *Divine Faith* muſt be taken in one of theſe three ſenſes; either firſt, that Faith may be ſaid to be *Divine*, which hath a *Divine Revelation* for its *Material Object*, as, that *Faith* may be ſaid to be a *Humane Faith*, which is converſant about natural cauſes, and the effects of them: And in this ſenſe it cannot but be a *Divine Faith*, which is converſant about the *Scripture*, becauſe it is a *Divine Revelation:* Or, *Secondly*, a *Faith* may be ſaid to be *Divine*, in regard of its *Teſtimony*, or *Formal Object*; and ſo that is called a *Divine Faith*, which is built on a *Divine Teſtimony*, and that a *Humane Faith* which is built on a *Humane Teſtimony:* Thus I aſſert, all that *Faith* which reſpects particular *Objects* of *Faith*, ſuppoſing the belief of the *Scriptures*, is in this ſenſe *Divine*, becauſe it is built on a properly *Divine Teſtimony*; but the Queſtion is, Whether that *Act of Faith* which hath the whole *Scripture*

as

as its *Material Object*, be in that ſenſe Divine or no. *Thirdly*, *Faith* may be ſaid to be *Divine*, in regard of the Divine *Effects* it hath upon the Soul of Man; as it is ſaid in *Scripture*, to *purifie the Heart*, *overcome the World*, *reſiſt Satan*, and his *Temptations*, *receive Chriſt*, *&c.* And this is properly a *Divine Faith*; and there is no queſtion, but every Chriſtian ought to have this *Divine Faith* in his Soul, without which the other ſorts of *Divine Faith* will never bring Men to Heaven. But it is apparent, that all who heartily profeſs to believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God*, have not this ſort of *Divine Faith*, though they have ſo firm an aſſent to the Truth and Authority of it, that they durſt lay down their Lives for it. The *Aſſent* therefore, we ſee, may be firm, where the effects are not ſaving: The Queſtion now is, Whether this may be called a *Divine Faith* in the ſecond ſenſe, that is, Whether it muſt be built on a *Teſtimony Infallible?* For clearing which, we muſt further conſider the meaning of this Queſtion, *How we know Scripture to be Scripture?* Which may import two things, *How we know that all theſe Books contain God's Word in them?* Or, Secondly, *How we know the Doctrine contained in theſe Books to be Divine?* If you then ask me, Whether it be neceſſary that I believe with ſuch a *Faith* as is built on *Divine Teſtimony*, that theſe *Books* called the *Scripture*, contain the Principles of the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian Religion* in them (which we call *God's Word*) I deny it, and ſhall do ſo, till you ſhew me ſome further neceſſity of it than you have done yet; and my reaſon is, becauſe I may have ſufficient ground for ſuch an *Aſſent*, without any *Divine Teſtimony*. But if you ask me, On what ground I believe the *Doctrine to be Divine*, *which is contained in theſe Books*; I then anſwer affirmatively, On a *Divine Teſtimony*; becauſe *God* hath given abundant evidence, that this *Doctrine* was of *Divine Revelation*. Thus you ſee, what little reaſon you have to triumph in your Argument *from Divine Faith*, inferring the neceſſity of an *unwritten Word of God*. But, the further explication of theſe things muſt be reſerved, till I come to the poſitive part of our way of *Reſolution of Faith*. I now return.

§. 8. Having, after your way (that is, very unſatisfactorily) attempted the vindicating your Reſolution of Faith, from the Objections which were offered againſt it by his Lordſhip; you come now to conſider the ſecond way propounded by him for the reſolving Faith, which is, *That Scripture ſhould be fully and ſufficiently known, as by Divine and Infallible Teſtimony, by the reſplendency of that Light which it hath in it ſelf only, and by the witneſs it can ſo give to it ſelf*; againſt which he gives ſuch evident Reaſons, that you acknowledge *the Relator himſelf hath ſufficiently confuted it, and you agree with him in the Confutation.* Yet herein you grow very angry with him, *for ſaying, That this Doctrine may agree well enough with your grounds, in regard you hold, that Tradition may be known for God's Word by its own Light, and conſequently the like may be ſaid of Scripture.* This you call *aſperſing you, and obtruding Falſhoods upon you.* Whether it be ſo or no, muſt appear upon examination. Two Teſtimonies are cited from *A. C.* to this purpoſe, the firſt is, *Tradition of the Church is of a Company, which by its own Light, ſhews it ſelf to be Infallibly aſſiſted.* Your Anſwer is, *That the word* [*which*] *muſt properly relate to the preceeding word Company, and not to the more remote word Tradition.* But what of all this? Doth any thing the leſs follow, *which the Biſhop charged A. C. with?* For it being granted by you, *That there can be no knowing an Apoſtolical Tradition, but for the Infallibility of the preſent Church*; the ſame *Light* which diſcovers the Infallibility of that Company, doth likewiſe diſcover the Truth of Tradition. If therefore your *Church* doth appear infallible by its own *Light*, which is your own confeſſion, May

P. 69. n. 10.

P. 69. n. 3.

not

not the *Scripture* as well appear infallible by its own Light. For is there not as great *Self-evidence*, at leaſt, that the *Scripture* is *Infallible*, as that your *Church* is *Infallible?* And therefore the way you take to ſhift the Objection, makes it return upon you with greater force: For, I pray tell me, how any Company can appear by its own *Light* to be aſſiſted by the *Holy Ghoſt*, and not much more the *Holy Scripture* to be Divine? Eſpecially ſeeing you muſt at laſt be forced to derive this *Infallibility* from the *Scriptures*. For, you pretend to no other Infallibility, than what comes by a promiſe of the *immediate aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt*. How then can any Company appear by *its own Light*, to be thus infallibly aſſiſted, unleſs it firſt appear by *its own Light*, that there was ſuch a *Promiſe?* And how can that, unleſs it antecedently appear by *its own Light*, that the *Scripture*, in which the Promiſe is written, is the *Word of God?* You tell us, *A. C.'s in-*
P. 70. *tention is only to affirm, That the Church is known by her Motives of Credibility, which ever accompany her, and may very properly be called her own Light*, How well you are acquainted with *A. C.*'s intention, I know not, neither is it much matter: For, granting this to have been his intention, may not the *Scripture* be known by *her Motives of Credibility*, as well as the *Church?* And do not theſe accompany her, as much as the *Church?* And may they not be called *her Light*, as properly as thoſe of the *Church?* It is plain then, by all the ſenſes and meanings you can find out, in the very ſame, that you ſay the *Church* may be known by *her own Light*, the *Scripture* may much more; and therefore you have no reaſon to quarrel with his Lordſhip for affirming it.

The ſecond Teſtimony produced, is, *That a Tradition may be known to be ſuch by the Light it hath in it ſelf; in which* (you ſay) *you find not one word of Tradition being known by its own Light.* But, who are ſo blind as thoſe who will not ſee? I pray, what difference is there between a Tradition being known to be *ſuch by its own Light*, and a *Tradition* being *known* by *its own Light?* Yes, ſay you, *known to be ſuch, implies, that is, to be God's unwritten Word*; but are not Doctrinal Traditions, and an unwritten Word, with you the ſame thing? Can therefore a Tradition be known to be an *unwritten Word* by its *own Light*, and not be known to be a *Tradition* by its *own Light?* Nay, How can it poſſibly be known to be an *unwritten Word*, unleſs it firſt appears to be a Tradition? For *Tradition* containing under it both thoſe that are *unwritten Words*, and thoſe that *are not*; it muſt, in order of nature, be known to be a *Tradition*, before it can be *known* to be the other: As I muſt firſt know you to be a *living Creature*, before I can know you to be a *reaſonable Creature*; and, I may much ſooner know the one than the other. You do therefore very well when you have given us ſuch occaſion for ſport, *to give us leave to laugh at it*, as you do in your next words.

§. 9. But before you leave this Point, you have ſome graver matter to take notice of, which is, that you deſire the Reader to conſider what the *Relator* grants, *viz. That the Church now admits of St.* James *and St.* Judes *Epiſtles, and the* Apocalypſe, *which were not received for diverſe Years, after the reſt of the New Teſtament.* From which you wiſely infer, *That if ſome Books are now to be admitted for Canonical which were not always acknowledged to be ſuch, then upon the ſame Authority ſome Books may now be received into the Canon, which were not ſo in* Ruffinus *his time. And therefore the Biſhop doth elſewhere unjuſtly charge the Church of* Rome, *that it had erred in receiving more Books into the Canon, than were received in* Ruffinus *his time.* To which I Anſwer, 1. By your own confeſſion then, the *Church of Rome* doth now receive into the *Canon* more Books than ſhe did in *Ruffinus* his time; from whence I enquire, whether the preſent *Church*

of

of Rome were *Infallible* in *Ruffinus* his time in determining the *Canon* of the *Scripture? If not*, then the *preſent Church* is no Infallible propounder of the *Word of God*, and then all your diſcourſe comes to nothing. *If ſhe were Infallible* then, ſhe cannot be now, for now ſhe determines *otherwiſe* as to a main *point* of *Faith* than ſhe did then; unleſs you will ſay, your *Church* can be *Infallible* in determining both parts of a contradiction to be true. 2. Is the integrity of the *Canon* of *Scripture* an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or no? I doubt not, but you will ſay, It is; if ſo, Whether were theſe Books which you admit now and were not admitted then, known to be of the *Canon* by this *Apoſtolical Tradition?* If not, by what right come they now to be of the *Canon?* If ſo, then was not your *Church* in *Ruffinus*'s time, much to ſeek for her *Infallibility*, in defining what was *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and what not? 3. Your main principle on which the lawfulneſs of adding more Books to the *Canon* of the *Scripture* is built, is, *That it is in the power of your Church judicially and authoritatively to determine what Books belong to the Canon of the Scripture, and what not*, which I utterly deny. For it is impoſſible that your *Church*, or any in the world, can by any definition make that *Book* to be *Divine*, which was not ſo before ſuch a definition: For the *Divinity* of the *Book* doth meerly ariſe from *Divine Revelation*. Can your *Church* then make that to be a *Divine Revelation*, which was not ſo? All that any *Church* in the world can do in this caſe, is, not to conſtitute any new *Canon*, which were to make *Books Divine* which were not ſo, but to uſe its utmoſt diligence and care in ſearching into the *authenticalneſs* of thoſe *Copies* which have any pretence to be of the *Canon*, and whether they did originally proceed from ſuch perſons, as we have reaſon to believe had an *immediate aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and according to the evidence they find that the *Church* may declare and give in her verdict. For the *Church* in this caſe is but a *Jury* of *grand Inqueſt* to ſearch into matters of *Fact*, and not a *Judge* upon the *Bench* to determine in point of *Law*. And that is the true reaſon, why the *Books* of the *New Teſtament* were gradually received into the *Canon*, and ſome a great while after others, as St. *James*, St. *Jude*, *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, and the *Apocalypſe*; becauſe at firſt, the Copies being not ſo publickly diſperſed, there was not that occaſion miniſtred to the *Church* for examination of them; upon which, when by degrees they came to be more publick, it cauſed ſcruples in many concerning them, becauſe they appeared no ſooner: eſpecially if any paſſages in them ſeemed to gratifie any of the *Sects* then appearing; as the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, the *Novatians*; and the *Apocalypſe*, the *Millennary's*: But when upon a through ſearch and examination of all circumſtances, it did appear that theſe Copies were autentical and did originally proceed from *Divine Perſons*, then they came to be admitted and owned for ſuch by the *Univerſal Church*, which we call being admitted *into the Canon of the Scripture*. Which I take to be the only true and juſt account of that which is called the conſtituting the *Canon of Scripture*, not as tho' either the *Apoſtles* met to do it, or St. *John* intended any ſuch thing by thoſe words in the end of *the Apocalypſe* (for that Book being as much liable to queſtion as any, how could that ſeal the *Canon* for all the reſt) much leſs, that it was in the power of any *Church* or *Council*, and leaſt of all of the *Pope*, to determine what was *Canonical*, and what not: but only that the *Church* upon examination and enquiry, did by her Univerſal reception of theſe *Books*, declare it ſelf ſatisfied with the *evidence* which was produced, that thoſe were true and authentick *Copies* which were abroad under ſuch names or titles, and that there was great reaſon to believe by a continued tradition from the age and time theſe Books were written in, that they were

were written by ſuch perſons, who were not only free from any deſign of *impoſture*; but gave the greateſt Rational evidence, that they had a more ſpecial and immediate aſſiſtance of God's Spirit. You ſee then, to how little advantage to your Cauſe you made this *digreſſion.*

§. 10. P. 70, 71. As to the third way propounded for reſolving the Queſtion, *How we know the Scriptures to be the Word of God*, viz. *by the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt*; three things you object againſt the *Biſhop's diſcourſe* about it; *Firſt, that his diſcourſe is roving and uncertain.* 2. *That notwithſtanding his brags he muſt have recourſe to a private ſpirit himſelf.* 3. *That tho' the Biſhop would ſeem to deny it, divers eminent Proteſtants do reſolve their Faith into the private ſpirit.* This being the ſubſtance of what you ſay, I ſhall return a particular Anſwer to each of them. For the firſt you tell us, *He delivers himſelf in ſuch a roving way of diſcourſe, as ſignifies nothing in effect as to what he would drive at.* No! that is ſtrange, when that which his *Lordſhip* drives at, is, to ſhew how far this opinion is to be allowed and how far not, which he is ſo far from roving in, that he clearly and diſtinctly propounds the ſtate of the queſtion and the re-

P. 71, 72. ſolution of it: which in ſhort is this, *If by the teſtimony of the ſpirit be meant any ſpecial revelation of a new object of Faith, then he denies the truth of it at laſt in an ordinary way, both becauſe God never ſends us to look for ſuch a teſtimony, and becauſe it would expoſe Men to the danger of Enthuſiaſms: but if by the teſtimony of the Spirit be meant the habit or the act of Divine infuſed Faith, by virtue of which they believe the object which appears credible, then he grants the truth but denies the pertinency of it, becauſe it is quite out of the ſtate of the queſtion, which inquires only after a ſufficient means to make this object credible, againſt all im-*

P. 74. n. 12. *peachment of folly and temerity in believing, whether Men do actually believe or not. And withal adds, that the queſtion is of ſuch outward and evident means, as other Men may take notice of, as well as our ſelves.* Judge you now, whether this may be called *roving*; if it be ſo, I can freely excuſe you from *it* in all the diſcourſes I have met with in your Book, who abhorr nothing more than a true ſtating, and methodical handling any queſtion.

But yet (ſay you) *the Biſhop cannot free himſelf from that imputation of recurring to the private ſpirit, againſt any that ſhould preſs the buſineſs home.* Sure you refer us here to ſome one elſe who is able to preſs a buſineſs home, for you never attempt it your ſelf; and inſtead of that, only produce a large teſtimony out of *A. C. That he did not acquit the Biſhop wholly of this.* Whether he did or no is to little purpoſe, and yet thoſe very words which his Lordſhip cites, are in your teſtimony produced out of him. Only what you add more from him, that he muſt be driven to it; that his *Lordſhip* denies, and neither *A.C.* or you have been able to prove it.

But tho' the Biſhop ſeems not only to deny any ſuch private revelation himſelf, but will not confeſs that any Proteſtants hold it; yet (you ſay) *there can be no doubt in this, ſince* Calvin *and* Whitaker *do both expreſly own it.* But according to thoſe principles laid down before, both theſe teſtimonies are eaſily anſwered. For, 1. Neither of them doth imply any *private revelation* of any *new object*, but only a particulur application of the evidence appearing in *Scripture* to the conſcience of every believer. 2, That theſe teſtimonies do not ſpeak of the *external evidence* which others are capable of, but of the internal

Inſtitut. l. 1. c. 7. ſect. 4. ſatisfaction of every ones conſcience. Therefore *Calvin* ſaith, *Si conſcientiis optimè conſultum volumus, &c.* If we will ſatisfie our own conſciences; not, If we will undertake to give a ſufficient reaſon to others of our Faith. So *Whi-*

Controv. de Script. q. 3. c. 1. *taker, Eſſe enim dicimus certius & illuſtrius teſtimonium quo nobis perſuadeatur hos libros eſſe ſacros, &c.* There is a more certain and noble teſtimony by which we may be perſwaded that theſe *Books* are ſacred, *viz.* that of the *Holy Ghoſt.*

3. Neither

3. Neither of these testimonies affirm any more, than the more judicious Writers among your selves do. Your *Canus* asserts *the necessity of an internal efficient cause, by special assistance of the spirit moving us to believe, besides and beyond all humane authorities and motives, which of themselves are not sufficient to beget Faith, and this* (a little after) *he calls, Divinum quoddam lumen incitans ad credendum, A divine light moving us to believe*; and again, *Interius lumen infusum à Spiritu Sancto, an inward light infused by the Spirit of God.* There is nothing in the sayings of the most rigid *Protestants* is more hard to explain or vindicate from a *private revelation* than this is: if, as you say, one would press it home. Nay hath not your own *Stapleton*, *Calvin*'s very phrase *of the necessity of the secret testimony of the Spirit that one believed the testimony and judgment of the Church concerning Scripture?* And is there not then as much danger of *Enthusiasm* in believing the Testimony of your *Church*, as in believing the *Scriptures*? Nay, doth not your *Gregory de Valentiâ* rather go higher than the testimonies by you produced out of *Calvin* and *Whitaker* on this very subject, in the beginning of his discourse of the *resolution of Faith? It is God himself*, saith he, *in the first place, which must convince and perswade the minds of Men of the truth of the Christian Doctrine, and consequently of the Sacred Scriptures, by some inward instinct and impulse; as it appears from Scripture it self, and is fully explained by Prosper.* If you will then undertake to clear this inward *instinct and impulse* upon the minds of Men, whereby they are perswaded of the truth of Christianity and Scripture, from *Enthusiasm* and a *private spirit* you may as easily do it for the utmost which is said by *Calvin*, or *Whitaker*, or any other *Protestant Divine*. This therefore is only an argument of your desire to cavil, and as such I will pass it over. For what concerns the influence which the *Spirit* hath in the resolution of *Faith*, it will be enquired into afterwards.

Id statuendum est, authoritatem humanam & incitamenta omnia illa prædicta, sive alia quæcunq; adhibita ab eo qui proponit fidem, non esse sufficientes causas ad credendum ut credere teneamur; sed prætereaopus est interiori causa efficiente, i. e. Dei speciali auxilio moventis ad credendum. Locor. theol. l. 2. c 8. Resp. ad 4. arg. l. 2. c. 8. sect. *Jam si hæc.*

Arcanum hoc divini Spiritûs testimonium prorsus necessarium est, ut quis Ecclesiæ testimonio ac judicio, circa Scripturarum approbationem credat. Triplicat. advers. Whitak. cap. 3.

Et verò Deus ipse imprimis est qui Christianam doctrinam, atq; adeò Scripturam sacram veram esse, voce revelationis suæ, & interno quodam instinctu & impulsu humanis mentibus contestatur atq; persuadet; ut in eâ ipsâ scriptura multis in locis est expressum, & præclarè à Prospero Aquitanico explicatur. De Analysi fidei l. 1. c. 1.

The *last way* mentioned in order to the *resolution of Faith*, is that of *Reason*, *which* (his Lordship saith) *cannot be denied to have some place to come in, and prove what it can. According to which* (he tells us) *no Man can be hindred from weighing the tradition of the Church, the inward motives in Scripture it self, all testimonies within, which seem to bear witness to it; and in all this* (saith he) *there is no harm: the danger is, when a Man will use no other scale but reason, or prefer reason before any other scale. Reason then, can give no supernatural ground into which a Man may resolve his Faith, that the Scripture is the word of God infallibly; yet Reason can go so high, as it can prove that Christian Religion, which rests upon the authority of this Book, stands upon surer grounds of nature, reason, common equity, and justice, than any thing in the world, which any Infidel, or meer naturalist, hath done, doth, or can adhere unto, against it, in that which he makes, accounts, or assumes as Religion to himself.* This is the substance of his Lordship's discourse about the use of Reason; in which we observe, §. 11. P. 74. n. 13. N. 14.

1. That he doth not make *reason* a means sufficient to ground as *Infallible belief, that Scripture is the word of God.* And therefore you are guilty of notorious oscitancy, or wilful calumny, in telling us, *That natural reason is introduced by the Bishop for that end.* By which we may guess at the truth of what you say at the end of your *interlocutory discourse between the Bishop and the Heathen, that you have not wronged him, by either falsly imposing on him, or dissembling the force of his arguments*, wherein you are so P. 72. l. 9, 10. P. 75. l. 5.

guilty, that the only extenuation of your crime had been, never to have profeſſed the contrary. For you give us a hopeful *ſpecimen* of your fair dealings at your entrance on this ſubject.

2. Though reaſon cannot give a *ſupernatural ground* whereby to reſolve *Faith* as to the *Scriptures being God's Word Infallibly*; yet reaſon may abundantly prove to any one who queſtions it, the *truth* and *reaſonableneſs* of *Chriſtian Religion*. By which if you pleaſe, you may take notice of a *double reſolution of Faith*; the one is, into the *truth* and *reaſonableneſs* of the *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity* conſidered in it ſelf; and the other is, into the *Infallible means* of the *conveyance* of that Doctrine to us, which is the *Scripture*. When therefore his Lordſhip offers to deal with a *Heathen*, he doth not as you, either ſillily or wilfully, would make him ſay, *That he would prove infallibly to him, that the Bible is God's Word*, but that *Chriſtian Religion* hath ſo much the advantage above all others, as to make it appear that it ſtands upon ſure grounds of *nature*, *reaſon*, *common equity* and *juſtice*, than any thing in the world, which any one who queſtions it doth adhere unto. Which I think is a thing that no one, who underſtands *Chriſtian Religion*, would be afraid to undertake againſt any *Infidel* of what ſort or nature ſoever. Theſe things being premiſed, your grand piece of *Sophiſtry in the diſpute between the Heathen and the Biſhop*, whom, you ſo ſolemnly introduce at a *Conference* about Religion, doth evidently
P. 72. n. 5. diſcover it ſelf. Wherein, *you bring in your learned Heathen, as one deſiring ſatisfaction in matter of Religion; but being not vers'd in Chriſtian Principles, deſires to be ſatisfied by the evidence of natural reaſon; which when the Biſhop hath condeſcended to; your very next thing is, that your Heathen underſtands by his Lordſhips Book, that the ſole foundation of our Faith is a Book called the Bible; which, ſaith he, you tell me muſt be believed Infallibly with every part and parcel in it, to be the undoubted Word of the true God, before I can believe any other point of Religion as it ought to be believed. As to which, your Heathen ſees no ground to aſſent that it is God's Word.* But by this way of management of your diſpute, we may eaſily diſcern which way the iſſue of it is like to go. Doth his Lordſhip any where undertake to prove this in the firſt place *Infallibly* to a *Heathen*, *That the Bible muſt be Infallibly believed to be God's Word?* No, he offers to prove, firſt, the *excellency* and the *reaſonableneſs* of the *Chriſtian Religion* conſidered it its ſelf. From whence you might eaſily conceive how the *diſpute* ought to be managed; ſhewing firſt that the *precepts* of Chriſtianity are highly juſt and reaſonable, the *Promiſes* of it ſuch as may induce any reaſonable Man to the *practice* of thoſe *Precepts*; and that the whole *Doctrine* is ſuch, as may appear to any conſiderative perſon to have been very wiſely contrived: That there is nothing vain or impertinent in it, but that it is deſigned for *great* and *excellent purpoſes*, the bringing Men off from the love of ſin to the love of *God*; that it is impoſſible to imagine any *Doctrine* to be contrived with more *advantage* for promoting theſe *ends*, becauſe it repreſents to us the higheſt expreſſions of the *Kindneſs* and *Goodneſs* of *God* to Man, and that the Promiſes made by *God* were confirm'd to the world by the death of his only Son; That ſince Mens *natures* are now ſo degenerate, *God* hath made a tender of *Grace*, and *divine aſſiſtance*, whereby to enable Men to perform the excellent duties of this Religion. That thoſe *things* which ſeem moſt hard to *believe* in this *Doctrine*, are not ſuch things as might have been ſpared out of it (as though *God* did intend only to puzzle Mens reaſon with them) but they are ſuch *myſteries*, as it is impoſſible the wit of Man can conceive they ſhould have been diſcovered upon better *reaſons*, or for more excellent *ends*; as, that a *Virgin*

ſhould

ſhould conceive by the immediate Power of God, to bring him into the World, who ſhould be the *Saviour* of it; *That there ſhould be a Reſurrection of Bodies*, in order to a compleat felicity of them who obey this Doctrine; and ſo for others of a like nature: That ſuppoſing it poſſible ſuch things ſhould be, it is impoſſible to conceive they ſhould be done upon better *grounds*, or for better purpoſes than they are in *Chriſtian Religion*. This being now a ſhort *Draught* or *Idea* of *Chriſtianity*, is the *firſt* thing which I ſuppoſe any learned or inquiſitive *Heathen* or *Infidel* ſhould be acquainted with; if he finds fault with this, let him in any thing ſhew the incongruity or unreaſonableneſs of it. If he acknowledge this Model of the *Doctrine* reaſonable, his next ſcruple is, Whether this be truly the *Model* of it or no; for that end I tell him, we have a *Book* among us, which is, and ever hath been, by *Chriſtians*, taken for granted, to comprize in it the Principles of *Chriſtian Religion*; I bid him take it, and read it ſeriouſly, and ſee if that which I have given him as the *Idea* of *Chriſtian Doctrine*, do not perfectly agree with that Book. I do not bid him preſently *abſolutely and infallibly believe this Book to be God's Word*, which is a very prepoſterous way of proceeding; but only compare the *Doctrine* with the *Book*, as he would do a Body of *Civil Law*, with the *Inſtitutes* of it; or the Principles of any Science, with the moſt approved Authors of it. If after this ſearch, he be ſatisfied, that the repreſentation I gave him of *Chriſtian Religion*, agrees with thoſe *Books* we call the *Bible*; he yet further adds, that he acknowledges the Principles of our *Religion* to be *reaſonable*; but deſires to be ſatisfied of the *Truth* of them; I muſt further enquire, Whether he doth believe any thing elſe to *be* in the World, beſides what he hath ſeen and heard himſelf? I may juſtly ſuppoſe his Anſwer *Affirmative*; I then demand upon what grounds? A. *Upon the certain report of honeſt Men, who have ſeen and heard other things than ever he did.* But why do you think honeſt Men's reports to be credible in ſuch caſes? A. *Becauſe, I ſee, they have no deſign or intereſt to deceive me in it.* Will you then believe the report of ſuch Men, whom, I can make it appear, could have no intereſt in deceiving you? A. *I can ſee no reaſon to the contrary.* Will you then believe ſuch Men, who loſt their lives to make it appear, that their Teſtimony was true? A. *Yes.* Will you believe ſuch things, wherein Perſons of ſeveral Ages, Profeſſions, Nations, Religions, Intereſts, are all agreed that they were ſo? A. *Yes, if it be only to believe a matter of fact on their Teſtimony; I can ſee no ground to queſtion it.* This is all I deſire of you, and therefore you muſt believe that there was in the World ſuch a Perſon as *Jeſus Chriſt*, who died, and roſe again; and, while he lived, wrought great *Miracles* to confirm his *Doctrine* with; and that he ſent out Apoſtles to Preach this Doctrine in the World, who likewiſe did work many *Miracles*, and that ſome of theſe Perſons the better to preſerve and convey this Doctrine, did write the ſubſtance of all that *Chriſt* either did, or ſpake, and withall penned ſeveral *Epiſtles* to thoſe *Churches* which were planted by them. Theſe are all *matters of Fact*, and therefore on your former Principle you are to believe them. There are then but two Scruples left: *Suppoſing all this true, yet this doth not prove the Doctrine Divine; nor the Scriptures, which convey it, to be Infallible.* To which I anſwer, 1. Can you queſtion, whether that *Doctrine* be *Divine*, when the *Perſon* who declared it to the World, was ſo *divine* and *extraordinary* a Perſon, not only in his Converſation, but in thoſe frequent and unparallel'd *Miracles* which he wrought in the ſight and face of his Enemies, who, after his death, did riſe again, and converſe with his Diſciples, who gave evidence of their Fidelity in the Teſtimony they gave of it, by laying down their Lives to atteſt the Truth of it? Again,

Can you queſtion the *Divinity* of that *Doctrine*, which tended ſo apparently to the Deſtruction of Sin and Wickedneſs, and the power of the evil *Spirit* in the World? For, we cannot think he would quit his poſſeſſion willingly out of the Bodies and Souls of Men; that therefore which threw him out of both, muſt be, not only a *Doctrine* directly contrary to his Intereſt, but infinitely exceeding him in *Power*: And that can be no leſs than *Divine*. But ſtill, you will ſay, *Is it not, beſides all this, neceſſary to believe theſe very Books, you call the Scripture, to be divinely inſpired; and how ſhould I know that?* To that I anſwer, 1. That which *God* chiefly requires from you, is, the belief of the *Truth* and *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*; for that is the *Faith* which will bring you to Obedience, which is the thing *God* aims at. 2. If you believe the *Doctrine* to be *True* and *Divine*, you cannot reaſonably queſtion the *Infallibility of the Scripture*. For, in that you read, that not only *Chriſt* did Miracles, but his *Apoſtles* too; and therefore their *Teſtimony*, whether writing or ſpeaking was equally *Infallible*; all that you want evidence for, is, that ſuch *Perſons* writ theſe *Books*, and that being a *matter of fact*, was ſufficiently proved and acknowledged before. Thus you ſee, if we take a right method, and not jumble things confuſedly together, as you do, what a ſatisfactory account may be given to any inquiſitive Perſon; firſt, of the *Reaſonableneſs*; next, of the *Truth*; and laſtly, of the *Divinity*, both of the *Doctrine*, and the *Books* containing it, which we call the *Scripture*.

§. 12. Let us now again ſee, *How you make the Biſhop and Heathen diſpute.* The ſubſtance of which, is, *That you make your Heathen deſire no leſs than Infallible evidence that the Bible is God's Word by conviction of natural Reaſon*; whereas his Lordſhip attempts only to make the *Authority of Scriptures* appear by ſuch Arguments, as unbelievers themſelves could not but think reaſonable, if they weighed them with indifferency. *For, though*, ſaith he, *this Truth, That Scripture is the Word of God, is not ſo demonſtratively evident* à priori, *as to inforce aſſent, yet it is ſtrengthened ſo abundantly with probable Arguments, both from the Light of Nature it ſelf, and Humane Teſtimony, that he muſt be very wilful and ſelf-conceited, that ſhall dare to ſuſpect it.* And ſure any reaſonable Man in the World would think it ſufficient to deal with an Adverſary upon ſuch terms. But, ſays your *Heathen*, *A Man cannot be infallibly certain of what is ſtrengthned with but probable Arguments, ſince that which is but probably true, may alſo be ſaid to be probably falſe.* Which being a thing ſo often objected againſt us by your party, muſt be ſomewhat further explained. How far *Infallibility* may be admitted in our belief, may partly be perceived by what hath been ſaid already, and what ſhall be ſaid more afterwards. That there is, and ought to be the higheſt degree of *actual Certainty*; I aſſert as much as you: But, ſay you, *The very Arguments being but probable, deſtroy it*: To which I anſwer, by explaining the meaning of *probable Arguments*, in this caſe; whereby are not underſtood ſuch kind of *Probabilities*, which cannot raiſe a firm *Aſſent*, in which ſenſe we ſay, *That which is probable to be, is probable not to be*; but by *Probabilities*, are only meant ſuch kind of *rational Evidence*, which may yield a ſufficient foundation for a *firm Aſſent*, but yet notwithſtanding, which an *obſtinate Perſon* may *deny Aſſent*. As for Inſtance, if you were to diſpute with the *Atheiſt* concerning the *Exiſtence* of a *Deity*, which he denies, and ſhould proceed with you juſt as your *Heathen* doth with the *Biſhop*. Sir, All that Religion that you talk of, is but only upon the belief of a *God*, but I cannot be *infallibly convinced by natural Reaſon, that there is ſuch a one.* You preſently tell him that there is ſo much evidence for a *Deity*, from the works of nature, the conſent of

P. 77. n. 15.

all

all People, &c. that he can have no reaſon to queſtion it. But ſtill he replies, *None of theſe are demonſtrations*, for notwithſtanding I have conſidered theſe, I believe the contrary; but *demonſtrations* would make me *infallibly certain*; theſe then are no more but *probable Arguments*, *and therefore ſince it is but prabably true, it may be probably falſe.* How then will you ſatisfie ſuch a Perſon? Can you do it any otherwiſe, than by ſaying, that we have as great *Evidence* as the nature of the *thing* will bear, and it is unreaſonable to require more? Unleſs you will tell him, it is to no purpoſe to believe a *God*, unleſs he *believe it Infallibly*; and there being no *Infallible Arguments* in nature, he muſt believe it on the *Infallibility of your Church.* And do you not think, this were an excellent way to confute *Atheiſts?* But when we ſpeak of *probable Arguments*, we mean not ſuch as are apt to leave the mind *in ſuſpenſe*, whether the thing be true or no; but only ſuch as are not *proper* and *rigid demonſtrations*, or *Infallible Teſtimony*, but the *higheſt Evidence* which the *nature* of the thing will bear, and therefore may cauſe an *undoubted Certainty* of *Aſſent.* As it is in all *matters of Fact*; for, Will you ſay, that it is as *probable*, that there is not ſuch a *place* as *Rome*, as that there is, becauſe the only Argument you have to be convinced of it, is but in it ſelf a *probability*, which is the fame and report of People. It is a piece therefore of great weakneſs of judgment, to ſay, That there can be no *certain Aſſent*, where there is a meer *poſſibility* of being deceived. For there is no kind of *Aſſent* in the hamane underſtanding, as to the exiſtence of any thing, but there is a *poſſibility* of *deception* in it. Will you ſay, becauſe it is poſſible all Men's Senſes may deceive them, therefore there can be no *certainty* of any Object of *Senſe?* And, as well may you ſay it, as deſtroy any certainty of *Aſſent* in *Religion*, where you ſuppoſe a poſſibility of being deceived. But, if I be not much deceived (though I ſuppoſe you will account it a grand *Paradox*) an *Aſſent* may be as firm and *certain* upon *moral grounds*, as upon a *demonſtration*, that is, when the *matter* is capable of no more than *moral grounds.* For, the reaſon why we *ſuſpend Aſſent*, is the *unproportionateneſs* of the *evidence* to the *matter* to be proved: So when the *matter* is capable of more *evidence* than is produced, and *I know it to be ſo*, my *underſtanding* cannot firmly *aſſent* on ſuch *evidence*; but when the *matter* is capable of no more than *moral evidence*, and *I know it*, I may as firmly *aſſent* to the *Truth* of ſuch a thing, as to the *Truth* of a *clearer* thing, upon clearer *evidence.* Thus I may as firmly *aſſent*, that there are ſuch *places* as the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies*, upon the conſtant report of Men, as that the *three Angles of a Triangle, are equal to two right Angles*: I ſay not, the *evidence* is the *ſame*, but that the *aſſent* may be as *firm.* You cannot then deſtroy the *certainty of aſſent*, which is required to *Chriſtian Religion*, by telling Men, that the *Arguments* they rely on, are but *moral Arguments:* And by this, you may ſee, there may be a degree far beyond *probability* in the *aſſent*, where the Arguments in themſelves conſidered, may be called *probable*; or rather, that *moral Certainty* may be a moſt *firm, rational*, and *undoubted Certainty.* Your following Diſcourſe *beeween the Biſhop and Heathen*, runs upon the former miſtake, as though his intention were to prove firſt the *Bible* to be *God's Infallible Word*, before he would prove *Chriſtian Religion to be true*, which I have already ſhewed you, is a miſtake, which appears ſufficiently by his own words, *of proving the Chriſtian Religion to ſtand upon ſurer grounds than any other Religion*; not only than *that one* which the *Heathen* believed, but *any other* in the World: And therefore your Objection is anſwered, that for all this, *a third Religion may be truer than both.* Your remaining Diſcourſe proves nothing at all, but on the former Suppoſition; and therefore, ſuppoſing his intention P. 73.

be

be to prove *Christianity* to be *True* and *Divine*, his Argument *from the power of it over the Devil*, follows plainly enough. And when he mentions the *evidence of it out of Scripture*, he doth not suppose the belief of it *as an Infallible Word of God*, but only as of any other *History*, and therefore is far from such a *petitio principii*, as you imagine. That which *the Bishop saith, may reasonably be supposed, as a Principle in Divinity* (as there are *postulata* in other Sciences) is not the *Infallibility of the Doctrine, or Revelation*, but the *Credibility* of both, in order to further *Conviction* concerning their *Infallibility*; for, unless the *Credibility* of it be first assumed as a *Principle*, Men will not use the means in order to conviction of its *Infallibility*. And in this sense he doth not contradict himself, nor unsay what he had said before; and that this was his sense, appears by the last words of that Discourse, *That a meer natural Man may be thus far convinced, that the Text of God is a very credible Text.* Thus we see, how much, notwithstanding your protestation to the contrary, *You have wronged the Bishop, both by falsly imposing on him, and dissembling the force of his Argument:* And how unjust that imputation is, *That if his Doctrine had been held in the Primitive Church, it would have laid the World under an impossibility of being converted to Christianity*; whereas I have shewed how consonant his way is, as I explained it, both to reason, and the proceedings of the Primitive *Christians* in the conversion of learned *Heathens*.

P. 80. n. 18.

§. 13. But since you will needs set *the Bishop to convert a learned Heathen*, I will see what an excellent faculty you have according to your Principles of satisfying an *Atheist*, or a *Sceptick in Religion*, whom, for your sake, I will suppose more desirous of satisfaction, than commonly such Persons are. Let us see then how he accosts you.

Scept. Sir, I understand by a *great Book of yours*, that you have only taken the right course to convince such Persons as my self, who are a little doubtful concerning the received Principles of Religion in the World; for the wisest I have conversed with, of those who own those things, do offer only to prove them by *Reason* and *Arguments*, which, I understand, you decry, *as a way to make all Men such as I am:* But that you have an excellent *Recipe* for Men under my *distemper*; for you promise them *no less than Infallible Ceriainty* in all things you require them to believe, which is a thing I have been so long seeking for, and have yet so unhappily mist of, that I cannot but rejoyce in meeting with such *a healing Priest*, who offers nothing short of *Infallibility* in all Matters of *Religion*.

T. C. Sir, I question not, but before you and I part, I shall cure those *distorted joynts* of your mind, and instead of being a *Sceptick*, make you a sound *Catholick*. For indeed it is true, what you say, That those who would convince you by Reason, do but offer to make you more a *Sceptick* than you are, at least, *you can have no Divine Faith at all upon such Principles*; but if you will follow my counsel, I doubt not but to make *you Infallibly certain* in the things we require you to believe.

Scept. I see then there is hope of a cure for me; but I pray tell me what that is I must be *Infallibly certain* of, and by what means I shall attain it. I would therefore in the *first place* be *Infallibly certain* of the *Being* of *God*, and the *Immortality of Souls*, for these I take to be the Principles of all Religion.

T. C. You take a wrong Method, you should first enquire after the *means* of this *Infallible Certainty*, for when once you have got that, it will make you *Infallibly certain* of what ever you desire; but as long as you use still so much *Reason*, as to demand *Infallible Certainty* in *Principles* before *Conclusions*, there is little hopes of your being a true *Roman Catholick*. But

I must

I must tell you, this is not the way: You must *first believe the Church*, and then you *may believe any thing.*

Scept. But would you have me attain *Infallible certainty*, without any *reason* that is *Infallible?* But because you quarrel with my method, I will yield to yours, but let me desire to know first, *What those things are which I must believe upon this Infallibility?* and then, *Whether nothing short of this Infallible certainty will serve in order to Faith?* for if so, I must confess my self not only a *Sceptick* but an *Infidel.*

T. C. *All objects of Faith must be believed with Infallible certainty*, and nothing short of *that* can be *true Faith*, for *true Divine Faith must rely on Divine Authority*, or some *Word of God:* now because you cannot rely *on God's written word* for the *Divine Authority of it self*, you must rely on some *Divine unwritten word*; which can be no other but what is delivered by the *Infallible Testimony* of the *present Roman Church.*

Scept. I was in hopes, you intended my cure, but now I perceive you aim at making me worse; for I never heard so many things uttered in a breath with so great confidence, and so little shew of reason; that if I were not a *Sceptick* already, I should Commence one now. You tell me indeed very magisterially, that I cannot believe without *Infallibility*, because *Faith* must rely on a *Divine Testimony*; this *Divine Testimony* is not in *Scripture* (as you call it) but in the *Infallibility* of your *present Roman Church*; I find my doubts so increase by this discourse of yours, that they all croud so to get out, I know not how to propose them in order, but as well as I can. You tell me the ground why you require *Infallible certainty*, is, because *Faith* must rest on *Divine Authority*, and that this *Authority* must be that of *your Church*, which you say is *Infallible:* these things therefore I desire of you, *first*, to shew *how your Churches Anthority comes to be Divine.* 2. How *her Testimony comes to be Infallible.* 3. *How I may be Infallibly certain of this Infallibility.* 4. Supposing the *Catholick Churches Testimony* to be so, how such a *Sceptick* as I am, should know your *Roman Church* to be that *Catholick Church.*

T. C. Your first question is, *How our Churches Authority comes to be Divine?* I see there is little hopes of doing good on you, that ask *such questions* as these are; you ought quietly *to submit your Faith to the Church*, and heartily believe all these things without questioning them; for I must tell you, such kind of *questions* have almost ruined us, and hath made scrupulous Men turn *Hereticks*, and others *Atheists:* but since I hope your *questions* may go no further than my *answers*, nor be any better understood; I must tell you; That though we say, that it is *necessary* that *Divine Faith* must rely on *Divine Authority* because that seems to promise *Infallibility*; yet when we come to our *Churches Testimony*, we dare not for fear of the *Hereticks* call it *Divine*, but *Infallible*, and *in a manner*, and *after a sort Divine*, hoping they would never take notice of any Contradiction in it, but still we say, *As far as concerns precise Infallibility, it is so truly supernatural and certain, that it comes nothing short of the Divinest Testimony; but yet this is not Divine, though it be by the Testimony of the Holy Ghost, and yet is no immediate revelation; but still it is so much, as if the Church should erre, God's veracity may be called in question assoon as the Churches.*

Scept. I took you for a *Priest* before, but now I take you for an absolute *conjurer:* but I confess, I like this *discourse* well, for I perceive your Religion is built on such *grounds*, as you never intend should be understood, wherein I commend your *discretion*; for these *distinctions* will doubtless do your work among silly and ignorant people, which are a great part of Mankind, and much the greatest of your *Church.* I am therefore infinitely satisfied with this

this anſwer to my *firſt queſtion*; anſwer but the reſt ſo, and I promiſe you to be leſs a *Sceptick* than ever I was.

T. C. To your ſecond, *How her Teſtimony comes to be Infallible*; becauſe I perceive you are *an underſtanding perſon*, I will acquaint you with our way, The *Hereticks* trouble us with this *queſtion* above all others: for they preſently cry out, If you know the *Scripture* to be *Infallible* by the *Church*, and the *Church Infallible* by *Scripture*, we run into a *Circle*; and this we know as well as they, but do not think fit to let the people know it, and therefore we tell them of *things being known in themſelves and to us*, between *the formal object and the Infallible witneſs*, between *the principal cauſe and a condition prerequiſite*, between *proving of it to Hereticks and to our ſelves*; but I ſee ſome of my brethren of late have been much beholding to ſome things with *vizards* upon them called *Motives of credibility*, and the generality are ſo frighted with them, that they will rather ſay they are ſatisfied than ask any more *queſtions*; but if they do, theſe do ſo little in *truth* belong to our *Church*, that then we ſtorm, and ſweat, and cry out upon them as *Atheiſts*, and that it is impoſſible they ſhould believe any Religion who queſtion them; and if that doth it not, then we patter over the former *diſtinctions* as we do our *prayers*, and hope they are both in an *unknown tongue*.

Scept. Well, I ſee you are the Man like to give me *ſatisfaction*; I pray to your third queſtion, *How I may be Infallibly certain of this Infallibility?*

T. C. That is a queſtion never asked by *Catholicks*, and if we find any propounding it whom we hoped to proſelyte, we give them *hard words* and leave them; for becauſe we offer to prove our *Infallibility* by only *motives of credibility*, they preſently ask us, Whether our *Infallibility* be *an Article of Faith?* if it be, then they may believe an *Article of Faith without Infallible certainty*, and then what need our *Churches Infallibility?* and then to what end do we quarrel with their *Faith* for being built on greater *motives of credibility?* which being ſuch untoward queſtions we ſee there is no good to be done on them and ſo leave them: but in our *Books* we are ſure to cry out of the *fallibility* and *uncertainty* of the *Faith of Proteſtants*, becauſe they acknowledge their *Church is not Infallible*, and cry up our *Church* becauſe ſhe *pretends* to it; if they ask, How we prove it, we ſeek to confound the *ſtate* of the *queſtion*, and run out into the *neceſſity of an unwritten Word*, or bring ſuch *motives* as hold only for the *Primitive* and *Apoſtolical Church*, and make them ſerve ours too. If all this will not do, we have other *ſhifts* ſtill, but it is not yet fit to diſcover them.

Scept. To your fourth *Queſtion* (and then I will tell you my judgment) *How your Church comes to be called or accounted the Catholick Church?*

T. C. For this, though it ſeems ſtrange to the *Hereticks*, how a *part* ſhould be called or accounted the *whole*, yet to all true *Catholicks*, *who muſt wink hard that they may ſee the better*, we make no great difficulty of it; for we tell them the *Pope* is *Chriſt's Vicar*, and it is the *head* which gives the *denomination*, and ſo *Catholick* is nothing elſe but a *name* to denote perſons who are in our *Church*; and if they queſtion this, they thereby are out of the *Church*, and ſo *under damnation*; But for the ſturdy *Hereticks* who deride our *thunderbolts*, we are put to a greater trouble, and are fain to gather all the *citations* of the *Fathers* againſt the poor *Donatiſts*, and apply them to the *Hereticks*, and whatever they ſay belongs to the *Catholick Church* we confidently arrogate it to *our ſelves*, as tho' our *Church* now were the ſame with the *Catholick Church* then: and chiefly we have the advantage of the *Proteſtants* by this, that whatever *corruptions* they charge us with, they had the good *hap* to be almoſt generally received at the time *Luther* appeared,

appeared, and upon this we *thunder* them with the *Succeſſion* and *Viſibility of our Church*; as the *Samaritans* were much to blame they did not ſerve the *Iſraelites* ſo, after their return from *Captivity*; for they had a *continual Succeſſion* in the ſame *place*, and a greater *viſibility* than the *Iſraelites* under their Bondage; but yet we had the advantage of them by a larger *ſpread*, a longer *preſcription*, and a fairer *ſhew*.

Scept. Sir, I am hugely taken with theſe Diſcourſes of yours, and eaſily perceive (whatever they that believe *Chriſtian Religion* to be true think) that you are Men of *Wit and Parts*; and underſtand your *Intereſt*, I mean *your Religion*. I underſtand now throughly, to what *intent* it is you ſay, that *Thoſe who build their Faith on rational Grounds, go about to deſtroy Religion*. I confeſs, you have taken the only way to reclaim me from any thing of *Scepticiſm*. I ſuppoſe you underſtand *my meaning*, as I do *yours*.

In this Diſcourſe I pretend not, as you did, to deliver his *Lordſhip's words*, and ſo wrong him by falſly impoſing them on him in another ſenſe than he intended them, but collect from your former managery of this Controverſie, what your real *ſenſe* and *meaning* is, and how excellent a *way* this is, inſtead of reclaiming *Atheiſts* to make them ſo. If I have miſtaken your meaning, I pray ſpeak more clearly, and then we ſhall think you mean *honeſtly*; but as long as you walk ſo much in the *dark*, you will give us leave to ſuſpect your deſign is either upon our *Purſes* or our *Religion*. I now return to your *Church-tradition*.

You begin your ſixth Section with a fair *Suppoſition*, and carry it on accordingly, *which is of a Child brought up in your Church, who is commanded to believe the Scriptures, and all other Articles of Faith on the Authority of your Church, whom you ſuppoſe to die without once looking into the Scriptures*: Your queſtion is, *Whether he had ſaving Faith or no; if ſo, then the Churches Authority is a ſufficient ground for Infallible Faith; if not, then he had none at all, and conſequently could not be ſaved*. I anſwer, We pry not into *Divine Secrets*, on which account we dare not pronounce of the final condition of ſuch, who through ignorance cannot be acquainted with *God's written Word*; we therefore ſay, that an *hearty aſſent to the Doctrine of the Goſpel* is the *Faith* which *God* requires, and if this *Faith* lead Men to Obedience to *God's Will*, we aſſert the ſufficiency of it for Salvation, and not otherwiſe; for *Faith* is not therefore *ſaving*, becauſe built on an *Infallible ground*, as you fondly ſeem to imagine; but when it *attains its end*, when it brings Men to a hearty obedience to the *Precepts* of the *Goſpel*. And if ſome among you, may believe that which is in it ſelf true, but upon weak and inſufficient grounds, as the advantages of Education (which are much rather the foundation of the Faith of ſuch a one as you ſpeak of, than any Infallibility ſuppoſed by him in the *Church*) yet ſuch, and ſo great is the Goodneſs of *God*, that if a *Faith* ſtanding on ſuch grounds do attain its end, that is, make ſuch a one univerſally holy, we deny not, but *God* may accept of it for Salvation. But ſtill we ſay, ſuch a *Faith* is ſo far from being *Infallible*, that it is not built on any ſufficient or ſatisfactory ground, for the *motive* of it is that, which may be *falſe* as well as *true*; for he that *aſſents* to any thing on the Authority of any *Church*, before he doth judge whether her Authority be to be relied on abſolutely or no, may believe a *Falſhood* aſſoon as truth upon that *Authority*; and the more he makes this his foundation, the more he is in danger of being deceived. As ſuppoſe a Child brought up in *Turky*, and inſtructed in that *Religion*; he is told that he muſt without examination believe *Mahomet's Alcoran* to be *Divine*; *and he muſt neither doubt of this, nor of any other Article of Faith, univerſally received among* §. 14. P. 7. n. 6.

Mahometans? May not such a one as invincibly believe the Authority of the *Turkish Church* (if we may call it so) as your *Child* doth the Authority of your *Church*? Where then lies the difference? You see plainly, it cannot be in the *Motive* to Faith, for the *Authority* is supposed equally *Infallible* in both; but it lies in the evidence of *Truth* in one Religion above the other, and this requires something more than the *Authority* of the *Church, viz.* judgment and diligent examination. And then Faith is built on a sure ground. Remember then, that we enquire not what abatements God makes for the *Prejudices* of *Education* in believing or not believing any Religion; nor how *God* intends to deal with them, who through Age, or other invincible Prejudices are uncapable of judging the evidence of truth in any Religion; but what are the certain *grounds* of *Faith*, which sober and understanding Men, may and ought to build their belief of true Religion upon. But you proceed, and *suppose your young Christian to live, and apply himself to study, and becomes a learned Man, and then upon the Churches recommendation betakes himself to the reading the Scriptures, upon which by the light he discovers in it he finds the Faith he had before, was but a humane perswasion, and not a Divine Faith, and consequently that he had no saving Faith of any Article of Christian belief, and so was out of the State of Salvation; from whence* (you say) *will spring Gripes and Torture of Spirit among Christians.* And, why so? What, because they discern greater reason to believe than ever they did, *must they find Gripes and Torture of Spirit?* I had thought, the more *Light* Men had found, *i. e.* the more *reason* for *believing*, the more Peace and Contentment they had in their Minds. And so I verily believe it is: But probably your meaning is, *This Doctrine will cause Gripes and Torture of Spirit in those who have no other foundation of Faith, but your Churches Authority, and never enquire after more:* If it does so, much good may they do them; and I verily believe, such doubts may tend more to their satisfaction at last, than their present security; and a Doctrine which tends to convince the World of their Folly and Unreasonableness of such a kind of *implicite Faith*, the unsuitableness of it to the nature of *Religion* in general, but more especially the *Christian* (whose great commendation is, that it puts Men upon so much searching and enquiry into the truth of it) would tend more to the good of the *Christian World*, than any of those *soft* and *easie Principles* which you seek to keep Men in *Obedience* by, and that I am afraid more to your *Church* than to *Christ*. Why then such a Doctrine should cause *needless Gripes and Tortures of Spirit*, I cannot imagine: It must certainly be a great confirmation to the *mind* of any good Man to see still further *reason* for his *Faith*, by which it grows more radicated and confirmed. Or would you have a Man disquiet himself, because he is not still a Child? Much such a kind of thing this is, that a Man's mind must be *tortured*, because his *Faith* grows *stronger*; for we assert that there are *degrees* in Faith; which you who make all Faith *Infallible* cannot do, unless you suppose an *Infallible thing* may grow more *Infallible*. And if all true Faith be *Infallible*, how can Men pray for the *increase of Faith*, unless they pray for the increase of their *Infallibility*; which is a Prayer, I suppose, not many in your *Church* are allowed to make, for then what becomes of your *Pope's Prerogative*, when not only every one among you is supposed to be *Infallible*, but hopes as well as prays to be more *Infallible*, which is more than your *Pope* or your *Church* dares pretend to.

But whether Doctrine tends more to *inward gripes* and *tortures of Spirit*, yours or ours, let any reasonable Man judge; for we assert that *true Faith* is capable of *degrees* of *augmentation*, but you assert that there is no *Divine Faith* but

but what is *Infallible*; when therefore Men by reflection upon themselves, are so far from finding such an *Infallibility* in their *Assent*, that they combate with many *doubts* and *fears*, as we see the *Apostles* did even after the *Resurrection of Christ*; you must pronounce that the *Apostles* w[illegible]hey questioned *Christ's Resurrection* from the Dead had no *Divine F*[illegible]: For it is plain they were far from an *Infallible assent* to it, *when* [illegible]*t up-braided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.* Were they infallible in their *assent* then or no? I hope you will not contradict Christ so much as to say so? Or had they no *Divine Faith* then at all? Was not St. *Peter*, for whom *Christ* prayed that his *Faith should not fail*, and from the *indefectibility* of whose Faith you derive that of the *Pope?* (But here you may see what a certain Foundation you have for it, when it is so apparent here, that St. *Peter's Faith* did fail, and that as to so important *an Article of Faith*, as *Christ's own Resurrection*; for certainly, St. *Peter* was one of the eleven.) Nay, Doth not *Christ upbraid* them for their *unbelief*, *in not believing them that had seen him after he was risen?* We see then, *Christ* chides them for not resolving their *Faith* into a humane and moral Testimony; If you had been there, no doubt you must have told him, *He was mistaken in the nature of Faith, which could rest on nothing but an infallible Testimony; and unless he shewed you by sufficient Motives, that those Persons who saw him risen, were infallible, for all his haste you were not bound to believe him.* But, whether Christ or you be the more infallible, judge you. We see our *Blessed Saviour* requires no more *Assent*, than the nature of the thing will bear, nay, he upbraids those who will not believe upon *Moral and Humane Testimony*; but you say just the contrary, as though you were resolved to contradict him: But that is sufficient Argument to all *Christians*, of the falsity and folly of your Doctrine, which tends to no other end, but to make all considering Men *Scepticks*, or *Atheists*. For, when you lay it down as a certain Maxim, that no *Faith* can be *Divine*, but what is *Infallible*; and they find no such *Infallibility* in the grounds or the nature of Men's *Assent*; What then follows, but those worst sort of *Gripes* and *Tortures*, such as argue an inward *Convulsion* of Mind, and bring Men to a greater Question, Whether there be any such thing, as that you call true *Divine Faith* in the World? You go on with your *Catechumen's Discourse*, who must suppose, *Either that the Church taught, that he was to believe Scripture Infallible, upon her own Infallible Testimony, or not; If so, then he reflects, that this Church hath plainly deceived him, and all others, who believed upon that Supposition, and so exposed them all to the hazard of eternal Damnation; and therefore was no true Church, but a deceiver. From whence* (say you) *he gathers, that her recommendation of Scripture, is as much as nothing, and so at last, is left to the sole Letter of Scripture, and so must gather from thence its Authority, or there can be no means left him on the Bishop's own Principles, to believe infallibly that Scripture is Divine, and the true Word of God.* This Discourse of yours consists of three Absurdities, which will follow upon one of your Churches questioning her Infallibility. 1. *That then your Church will be guilty of Imposture.* 2. *Then the Churches Testimony signifies nothing.* 3. *That then the sole Letter of Scripture must assure Men of its Divine Authority.* For the *first*, I must confess him whom before you supposed a *Child*, to be now grown to Years of Understanding, since he doth so wisely reflect on himself, as to your *Churches gross Imposture*, in her pretence of *Infallibility*; and, no doubt, it is one of the *greatest* which hath been known in the *Christian World*, which you cannot your self deny, supposing that it be not true that she is *Infallible.* For, Can there be any higher

Mark 16. 14.

P. 75, 76.

Cheat in the World, than under a pretence of *Infallibility*, to impose things upon Men's *Faith*, which are contrary to the *Sense* and *Reason* of Mankind, to keep them from that inward satisfaction, which their Souls might find from a serious consideration of the *excellent nature of Christian Religion*, and a diligent *practice* of it, to contradict thereby the very scope of *Christianity*, which *Courts* our esteem, by offering it self to the faireſt Tryal; when, I say, under this pretence *Christian Religion* is apparently dishonoured, the welfare of Men's Souls hindered, and the greateſt Corruptions obtruded, without possibility of amendment of them, excuse your *Church* from *Imposture* if you can; for my part, I cannot, nor any one else who throughly considers it. For the *second*; it will follow indeed, that the Testimony of your *Church* is as much as nothing, as to any *Infallible Foundation of Faith*; but yet it may be of great *use* for conveying *Universal Tradition* to us, and so by that *delivering* the *Scripture* into our hands, as the *Infallible Rule of Faith*. To the *Third*; It by no means follows, that there is nothing but the *sole Letter of Scripture* left to convince us of the *Divine Authority of Scripture*; I hope the *working Miracles*, *fulfilling Prophecies*, the *nature* and *reasonableness of the Doctrine of Scriptures*, are all left besides the bare Letter of Scripture; and these, we say, are sufficient to make us believe, that the Scripture contains the infallible Word of God.

§. 15. Now your *profound Christian* begins to reflect on the *Bishop's way*, *which is* (say you) *That the Testimony of the Church is Humane and Fallible*, *and that the belief of the Scripture rests upon the Scripture it self.* But, it will be more to our purpose, to hear the *Bishop* deliver his own Mind, than to hear you so lamely deliver it; which, in short, he sums up thus. *A Man is*

P. 83. *probably led by the Authority of the present Church*, *as by the first informing*, *inducing*, *perswading means*, *to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: But*, *when he hath studied*, *considered*, *and compared this Word with its self*, *and with other Writings*, *with the help of ordinary Grace*, *and a Mind morally induced*, *and reasonably perswaded by the Voice of the Church*, *the Scripture then gives greater*, *and higher Reasons of Credibility to it self*, *than Tradition alone could give. And then*, *he that believes*, *resolves his last and full Assent*, *that Scripture is of Divine Authority*, *into internal Arguments found in the Letter it self*, *though found by the help of Tradition without*, *and Grace within.* This is the substance of his *Lordship's* Opinion, against which we shall now consider what your Discourser hath to object.

P. 76. 1. The *first*, is from the case of *ignorant and illiterate Persons*; *such*, *who either through want of Learning could not read the Scripture*, *and examine*, *or else made little use of it*, *because they supposed they might have Infallible Faith without it*; *What then becomes of millions of such Souls*, *both in former and present times?* To this I answer; Although the *Ignorance* and Careleſness of Men in a matter of so great consequence, be so great in all *Ages*, as is not to be justified, because all Men ought to endeavour after the higheſt ways of *satisfaction*, in a matter so nearly concerning them (and it is none of the leaſt things to be blamed in your Church, that she doth so much countenance this ignorance, and neglect of the *Scripture*) yet for such Persons, who either morally, or invincibly, are hindred from this capacity of examining *Scripture*, there may be sufficient means for their *Faith* to be built upon. For, although such illiterate Persons cannot themselves see, and read the *Scripture*, yet, as many as do believe, do receive the *Doctrine* of it, by that *sense* by which *Faith* is conveyed, that is, *Hearing*; and by that means they have so great *certainty*, as excludes all *doubting*, that such *Doctrines*, and such *matters of fact*, are contained in these *Books*, by which they come to the

the understanding of the nature of this *Doctrine*, and are capable of judging concerning the *Divinity* of it. For the *Light* spoken of in *Scripture*, is not a *Light* to the *eye*, but to the *mind*; now the *mind* is capable of this *light*, as well by the *ear*, as by the *eyes*. The case then of such *honest illiterate Persons*, as are not capable of reading *Scripture*, but diligently and devoutly hear it read to them, is much of the same nature with those who heard the *Apostles* Preach this *Doctrine* before it was writ. For, whatever was an Argument to such to believe the *Apostles* in what they spake, becomes an Argument to such who hear the same things, which are certainly conveyed to us by an *unquestionable Tradition*: So that nothing hinders, but such illiterate Persons may resolve their *Faith* into the same *Doctrine* and *Motives* which others do, only those are conveyed to them by the *ear*, which are conveyed to others by the *eyes*. But, if you suppose Persons so rude and illiterate, as not to understand any thing, but that they are to believe as the *Church* believes; do you, if you can, resolve their *Faith* for them; for my part, *I cannot*, and am so far from it, that I have no reason to *believe* they can have any.

2. The *second* thing objected by your Discourser is, *That if the Churches judgment be fallible, then much more one's own judgment is fallible. And therefore, if, notwithstanding all the care and pains taken by the Doctors of the Church, their perswasion was only humane and fallible; what reason hath any particular Person to say, That he is divinely and infallibly certain by his reading the Scripture, that it is Divine Truth?* But, 1. Is there no difference between the *Churches Perswasion*, and the *Churches Tradition?* Doth the *Bishop deny*, but the perswasion of the *Doctors* of the *Church*, is as *infallible*, as that of any particular Person? But this he dies, that they can derive that *Infallibility* of the *grounds* of their *Perswasion* into their *Tradition*, so as those who are to receive it on their Testimony, may be competent Judges of it. May we not then suppose their Tradition to be *humane* and *fallible*, whose perswasion of what they deliver, is established on *infallible grounds?* As a *Mathematician* is demonstratively convinced himself of the truth of any particular *Problem*; but, if he bids another *believe* it on his *Testimony*, the other thereby hath no *demonstrative evidence* of the *Truth* of it, but only so great *moral evidence*, as the *Testimony* of that Person carries along with it. The case is the same here: Suppose those Persons in the *Church* in every *Age* of it, have to themselves *infallible evidence* of the *Divinity* of the *Scripture*, yet when they are to deliver this to be believed by others, unless their *Testimony* hath *infallible evidence* in it, Men can never have more than *humane* or *moral certainty* of it. 2. It doth not at all follow, that if the *Testimony* of the *Church* be *fallible*, no particular Person can be *infallibly assured* of the *Divinity* of the *Scripture*, unless this assurance did wholly depend upon that *Testimony*; indeed, if it did so, the Argument would hold, but otherwise it doth not at all. Now, you know, the *Bishop* denies that the *Faith* of any particular *Person* doth rest upon the judgment of the *Church*; only he saith, This may be a *Motive* and *Inducement* to Men, to consider further; but that which they rely upon, is, that *rational evidence* which appears in the *Scripture* it self.

3. He goes on, and argues against this use of Tradition, thus, *If the Light of the Scripture be insufficient to shew it self, unless it be introduced by the Recommendation of the Church; How came* Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Husse, *&c. to discover this Light in it, seeing they rejected the Authority of all visible Churches in the World?* &c.

Sure your Discourser was not very profound in this, that could not distinguish between the *Authority of Universal Tradition*, and *the Authority of*

of the preſent viſible Church, or between the *Teſtimony* of the *Church*, and the *Authority* of it. Shew us where *Luther*, *Calvin*, &c. did ever reject the *Authority* of an *uncontrouled univerſal Tradition*, ſuch as that here mentioned concerning the *Scriptures being the Word of God*: Shew us where they deny that *Uſe* of the Teſtimony of thoſe *Churches*, whoſe Authority in impoſing *Matters of Faith* they denied, which his *Lordſhip* aſſerts, *viz.* to be a means to introduce Men to the knowledge and belief of the *Scriptures*; and, unleſs you ſhew this, you do nothing.

4. He argues againſt that *Light* in Scripture, *becauſe it is not ſufficient to diſtinguiſh Canonical Books from ſuch as are not ſo*; *For* (ſays he) *Had not the Ancient Primitive Fathers in the firſt three hundred Years, as much reaſon and ability to find this Light in Scripture, as any particular Perſon? Yet many Books which do appear to us to be God's Word, by their Light, did not appear to be ſo to them by it, till they were declared ſuch by the Catholick Church.* I anſwer, 1. Where doth his *Lordſhip* ever ſay, or pretend, that any Perſon, by the *Light* contained in the *Books*, can diſtinguiſh *Books* that are *Canonical*, from ſuch as are not? All that can be diſcovered, as to particular *Books* in queſtion, is, the examination of the *Doctrine* contained in them by the *Series* of that, which is in the unqueſtionable Books; for, we know, that *God* can never ſpeak *contradictions*: But ſtill this will only ſerve to exclude ſuch *Books* as contain things contrary, but not to admit all which have no *Doctrine* contrary to *Scripture*. 2. The reaſon why the *Primitive Fathers* queſtioned any *Books* that we do not, was not becauſe they could not diſcover that *Light* in them, which we do; for neither can we diſcover ſo much *Light* in any particular Book, as meerly from thence to ſay, It is *Canonical*; but there was not ſufficient *evidence* then appearing to them, that thoſe *Copies* did proceed from *Apoſtolical Perſons*; and this was therefore only an Argument of that commendable Care and Caution which was in them, leſt any Book ſhould paſs for *Canonical*, which was not really ſo. 3. When the *Catholick Church* declared any controverted Book to be *Canonical*; Did not the *Church* then ſee as much Light in it as we do? But that *Light* which both the *Church* and we diſcover, is not a diſcriminating *Internal Light*, but an *External Evidence* from the ſufficiency, and validity of *Teſtimony*. And ſuch we have for the *Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament*; and therefore you have no cauſe to quarrel with us, *for receiving them from the* Jewiſh *Synagogue*; For who, I pray, are ſo competent witneſſes of what is delivered, as they who received it? And the *Apoſtle* tells us, *That to the* Jews *were committed the Oracles of God.*

5. Hence your diſcourſing *Chriſtian* argues, *That if one take up the Scripture on the account of Tradition, then if one ſhould deny St.* Matthew's *Goſpel to be the written Word of God, he could not be accounted an Heretick, becauſe it was not ſufficiently propounded to him to be God's Word.* Whether ſuch a Perſon may be accounted a *Heretick* in your ſenſe, or no, I am ſure he is in St. *Paul*'s, becauſe αὐτοκατάκριτος, *ſelf-condemned*, and that for the very contrary reaſon to what you give, *becauſe this is ſufficiently propounded to him.* I pray tell me, What way you would have ſuch a thing *ſufficiently propounded* as a *matter* to be believed, that this is not propounded in? Would you have an unqueſtionable evidence, that this was writ by one of *Chriſt's Apoſtles*, called St. *Matthew*? So you have. Would you have all the *Churches* of *Chriſt* agreed in this *Teſtimony* in all *Ages* from the *Apoſtles* times? So you have. Would you have it delivered to you by the Teſtiſhony of the *preſent Church*? So you have. What then is, or can be wanting, in order to a *Propoſition* of it to be believed? Why, forſooth, ſome

infallible,

infallible, authoritative ſentence of the preſent Church, which ſhall make this an Object of Faith. See what a different mould ſome Men's minds are of from others! For my part, ſhould I ſee, or hear any *Church* in the World, undertaking ſuch an office as that, I ſhould be ſo far from thinking it more ſufficiently propounded by it, that I ſhould not ſcruple to charge it with the greateſt Preſumption and Arrogance that may be. For, on what account can it poſſibly be a thing credible to me, that St. *Matthew*'s *Goſpel* contains *God's written Word* any further, than it is evident that the *Perſon* who wrote it, was one choſen by *Chriſt*, to deliver the ſumm of his proceedings, as an *Apoſtle*, to the World? And therefore I have no reaſon to think, he would deceive Men in what he ſpake or writ: The only Queſtion then is, How I ſhould know this is no counterfeit name, but that St. *Matthew* writ it? Let us conſider, what poſſible means there are to be aſſured of it. I cannot imagine any but theſe two; Either that *God* ſhould immediately reveal it either to my ſelf, or to ſome *Church* to propound it to me; or elſe, that I am to believe thoſe *Perſons* who firſt received thoſe *Copies* from his hands, by whoſe means they were diſperſed abroad in the World, from whence they are conveyed by an *unqueſtionable Tradition* down to us. Of theſe two, chuſe whether you pleaſe: If the *firſt*, then particular *immediate Revelations* are neceſſary to particular Perſons, to have ſuch an *Object of Faith* ſufficiently propounded to them, and then the *Church* cannot authoritatively pronounce any *Books of Scripture* to be *Canonical*, without immediate Revelation to her, that this Book was written by ſuch a Perſon, who was *divinely aſſiſted* in the writing of it. And this you have denied before to belong to the *Church*. If you take up with the *ſecond*, the *unqueſtionable Teſtimony of all Ages, ſince the Apoſtles*; then judge you whether St. *Matthew*'s *Goſpel* be not ſufficiently propounded to be believed; and conſequently, Whether any one who ſhould queſtion or deny it, be not guilty of the greateſt peeviſhneſs and obſtinacy imaginable. From hence we may ſee, with what ſuperfluity of diſcretion the next words came from you; *Nay, hence it follows, that even* P. 11.
our Bleſſed Saviour, who is Wiſdom it ſelf, would have been eſteemed by all the World, not a wiſe Law-giver, but a meer Ignoramus *and Impoſtor.* For ſhame, Man, forbear ſuch inſolent expreſſions for the future, and repent of theſe. For, Muſt *Chriſt's Wiſdom* be called in queſtion, and he liable to be accounted an *Ignoramus and Impoſtor*, if he doth not make your *Church Infallible?* I have told you often before, how much your *Doctrine of Infallibility* tends to *Atheiſm*, and now you ſpeak out. For the meaning of your words plainly is, *If God hath not entruſted your Church with a full and abſolute power to declare what is his Will, and what not, Chriſt was an* Ignoramus *and Impoſtor.* For that is the ſubſtance of your next words. *For, had he not framed, think you, a ſtrange and Chimerical Common-wealth, were it alone deſtitute of a full and abſolute power, to give an authentical and unqueſtionable Declaration, which is the true and genuine Law?* Now, it is evident from all your Diſcourſe foregoing, you only plead for this full and abſolute power in *your Church*; and judge you then what the conſequence is (to all thoſe who cannot ſee any ſhadow of reaſon for this your pretended Infallibility) neither more nor leſs, than that *Chriſt's is liable to be accounted by all the World an* Ignoramus *and Impoſtor*: Nay, that they are *fools*, who account him not ſo; if they do not believe this *preſent Infallibility of your Church*; *for it is apparent* (ſay you) *that he hath ordered his Common-wealth worſe than ever any one did.* And now let any that conſider what pitiful ſilly proofs you have produced for this preſent Infallibility (nay, ſuch, that I am confident, that you cannot think your ſelf you have in the leaſt meaſure proved it) then judge, what

thoughts

thoughts of *Christ* you are forced to entertain your self upon your own Argument, *viz. as of an Ignoramus and Impostor.* Hath not your *Infallibility* led you now a fine dance? Is not this the way to make *Faith certain*, and to reclaim *Atheists?* I had thought it had been enough for your *Canonists*, to have charged *Christ with Indiscretion*, if he had not left a *Vicar* on Earth; but now, it seems, the *profound Philosophers*, *learned Divines*, and *expert Historians* (for such a one, you told us, your discoursing *Christian* was supposed by you to be in whose name these words are spoken) do charge *Christ* with folly and imposture, if he hath not made your *Church Infallible.* For, shift it off as you can, you cannot deny but that must be the aim of these words: For you are proving the necessity of an *infallible Declaration* by the *present Church*, in order to a *sufficient Proposition* of the *Scripture* to be *believed*; and it is notorious you never pretend that any *Church* hath any share in this *Infallibility*, but your own; and therefore the consequence unavoidably follows, that since there can be no *sufficient Proposition*, that the *Scripture* is to be believed without this *infallible Testimony*; since no *Church* pretends to this *Infallibility*, but *yours*; since, without such provision for the *Church*, *Christ would have been esteemed by all the World not a wise Law-giver, but a meer* Ignoramus *and Impostor*; What then follows, but that if your *Church* be not *infallible*, He must be accounted so? And if you dread not these consequences; I hope all *Christians* do, and have never the better thoughts of your *Infallibility* for them.

6. Let us see, how he comes closer to the matter it self; and examines how *this Light should be Infallible, and Divine, supposing the Churches Testimony to be humane and fallible.* The substance of which, is this, *If the Church may* P. 77. *err, we may suppose she hath erred in testifying some Books to be God's Word; in that case, Books that were not God's Word, would be equally recommended with those that were: And that it would be impossible for any particular Person, by reading them, to distinguish the one from the other.* To which I answer, 1. It is all one with you to suppose a *Church fallible*, and suppose that *she hath erred.* To put a case of a like nature. The Testimony of all Mankind is *fallible*; May you therefore suppose that all Mankind hath *erred* in something they are agreed in? The Testimony of all those Persons who have seen *Rome*, is fallible; May I therefore question whether they were not all deceived? But of this afterwards. 2. When you speak of the *Church erring*, Do you mean the *Church in every Age since Christ's coming, concerning all the Books of Scripture?* Or, *the present Church, concerning only some Books of Scripture?* If you suppose, the *Church* of *all Ages* should be deceived, you must suppose some, who were *Infallible*, should *be deceived*; those were the *Apostles* in writing and delivering their *Books* to the *Churches* of their time; or else you must suppose all the *Apostolical Churches* deceived in taking those *Books* to have come from the *Apostles*, which did not; And is not this a congruous Supposition? Well then, if it be unreasonable to suppose the *Apostolical Churches* deceived, and impossible to imagine the *Apostles* deceived, in saying, They writ what they did not: Where then must such an universal Error as this come in? Or, Is it not equally unreasonable to suppose all the *Christian Churches* in the World should be deceived, without any questioning of such a deceit, supposing but the goodness and common Providence of *God* in preserving such Records, and the moral Industry used by *Christians*, in a matter of such importance? It is therefore a very absurd and unreasonable thing, to imagine, *That all the Churches of Christ, in all Ages, should err in receiving all the Books of Scripture.* Let us then see, as to the present *Churches* erring, as to *particular Books*: 1. Either the *Records* of former *Ages* are left to judge by, or no? If they be, as certainly they are,

we

we thereby ſee a way to correct the *errour* of the *preſent Church*, by appealing to theſe records of the *Church* in former times? if they be not left, how could any of theſe *Books* be derived from *Apoſtolical Tradition*, when we have no means to *trace* ſuch a *Tradition* by? 2. Suppoſing only ſome *Books* queſtioned, or that the *preſent Church* errs only in ſome particular Books; then it appears that there remains a far greater number of ſuch *Books*, whoſe Authority we have no reaſon at all to queſtion, and by comparing the other with theſe we may eaſily prevent any very dangerous errour; for if they contain any *Doctrine* contrary to the former, we have no reaſon to believe them; if they do not, there can be no very dangerous *errour* in admitting them. Thus you ſee how eaſily this *errour* is prevented, ſuppoſing the *Churches* teſtimony not only fallible, but that it alſo ſhould actually *err* in delivering ſome *Books* for *Canonical*, which are not ſo: but ſuppoſing a *Church* pretends to be *Infallible* and is believed to be ſo, and yet doth actually *err* in delivering the *Canon* of *Scripture*, what remedy is there then? for while we look on the *Churches* teſtimony as *fallible*, there is ſcope and liberty left for enquiry and further *ſatisfaction*, but if it be looked on as *Infallible*, all that believe it to be ſo are left under an impoſſibility of eſcaping that *errour* which ſhe is guilty of. And the more dangerous ſuch an errour is, the worſe the condition is of all ſuch who believe the *Churches Teſtimony* Infallible. Now this is that we juſtly charge your Church with, that while ſhe pretends to *Infallibility*, ſhe hath actually *erred* in delivering ſuch *Books* for *Canonical* which are not ſo, as hath been abundantly manifeſted by the Worthies of our Church. The remainder of this diſcourſe of yours concerning knowing *Canonical Books by the light in them*, is vacated by our preſent anſwer; and ſo is the other concerning *Apoſtolical traditions* by our former, upon that ſubject. As to that Scruple, *How the light ſhould be Infallible and Divine, when the Churches Teſtimony is humane and fallible*, it ſignifies nothing unleſs the light be only ſuppoſed to riſe from the *Teſtimony*, which his Lordſhip denies.

§. 16. 7. *The judgment of the Fathers is enquired into* concerning the preſent ſubject; out of whom only *Irenæus* and S. *Auguſtin* are produced, as affirming in many places, *That the Tradition of the Church is ſufficient to found Chriſtian Faith even without Scripture, and that for ſome hundreds of years after the Canon of Scripture was written.* But muſt we ſtand only to the judgment of theſe two concerning the ſenſe of the Primitive *Church* in this preſent Controverſie? We may eaſily know the judgment of the *Fathers*, if two ſuch lame Citations as theſe are, are ſufficient to diſcover it. But your unhappineſs is great in whatever you undertake: If you meddle with *reaſon*, you ſoon find how little it *becomes* you: If you fly to the *Fathers*, they prove the greateſt *witneſſes* againſt you; as will appear in this debate, if we firſt examine the *citations* you produce, and then ſhew how fully and clearly theſe very *perſons* whom you have picked out of all the *Chorus*, do deliver themſelves againſt you. The firſt *citation* is that known one, out of *Irenæus*, concerning thoſe *barbarous nations who believed without the Scriptures, adhering to the Tradition of the Apoſtles, having ſalvation written without Paper and Ink.* But what is it you would hence infer, I cannot imagine, unleſs it be one of theſe two things; 1. That *if we had no Scriptures left us, it would be neceſſary for us to believe on the account of Apoſtolical Tradition*; that is, that the grounds of our Faith were ſo clear and evident of themſelves, that tho' they had never been written, yet if they had been conveyed by an unqueſtionable Tradition from the *Apoſtles*, there had lain an obligation on us

Iren. l. 3. c. 4.

Quid autem, ſi neque Apoſtoli quidem ſcripturas reliquiſſent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem ſequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Eccleſias? Cui ordinationi aſſentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, qui in Chriſtum credunt, ſine charta & atramento ſcriptam habentes ſalutem, & veterem traditionem cuſtodientes.

to believe the *Doctrine of Christ*. But, is this our case? hath not *God* infinitely better provided for us, when (as your other witness S. *Augustine* speaks) *Whatever our Saviour would have us read of his actions or speeches, he commanded his Apostles and Disciples as his hands to write.* Christian Religion is now no *Cabbala* to us. *God* hath *consigned* his will over to us, by *Codicils* of his own appointing; and must we then be now in the like case, as if his Will had never been written at all? 2. But what if the *barbaroas Nations did believe without the Books of Scripture*; what doth that prove, but only this; that there may be sufficient reason to believe in *Christ* where the *Scriptures* are not known? Is that contrary to us who say, *The last resolution of Faith* is into the *Doctrine of Christ* as attested by *God*: now if that *attestation* be sufficiently conveyed, there is an obligation to believe; but withal we say, that *to us who enjoy the Scriptures* as delivered down to us, the only certain and infallible *conveyance* of *God's Word* to us is by them. So that the whole *Christian World* is obliged to you for your civil comparison of them, with those *Barbarians* who either enjoyed not the *Scriptures*, or in probability were not able to make use of them, as being probably ignorant of the *use of letters*. 3. Doth *Irenæus* in these words say, that even these *Barbarians* did believe upon the *Infallible Testimony* of the *present Church*? No; he mentions no such thing, but that they believed that *Tradition of Doctrine* which was delivered them from the *Apostles*. I ask you then; Suppose at that time some *honest* but *fallible persons* should have gone into *Scythia*, or some such *barbarous places*, and delivered the *Doctrine of the Gospel*, and attesting the *matter of fact* as being *eye-witnesses of Christ's Miracles, Death, and Resurrection*, whether would these *Barbarians* have been bound to believe or no? If not, then for all I know, *Infidelity* is a very excusable sin; If they were, I pray tell me what it was their *Faith* was resolved into; was it an infallible testimony of fallible Men? And the same case is, of such who should preach the same *Doctrine* from these *eye-witnesses* in another *Generation*, and so on: for although there might be no reason to question their testimony, yet I suppose you will not say, It is *Infallible?* so that still this makes nothing for your purpose. 4. Who better understood *Irenæus* his mind, than *himself?* let us therefore see what he elsewhere tells us *is the foundation and pillar of our Faith who have received the Scriptures.* Doth not he tell us, but three Chapters before this, *That we have received the method or Doctrine of our Salvation, from those persons who preached it; which by God's command they after delivered in the Scriptures, which were to be the foundation and pillar of our Faith?* Could any thing be more fully spoken to our purpose than this is? Whereby he shews us, now the *Scriptures* are consigned unto us, what that is which our Faith must stand upon: not the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, but that *Word of God* which is delivered to us. This therefore he elsewhere calls the *Unmovable Canon of our Faith*, as S. *Augustine* calls it *Divinam stateram, the Divine Balance* we must weigh the grounds of our Belief in.

Quicquid Servator de suis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. De Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. ult.

Non per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quàm per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. Iren. l. 3. cap. 1.

Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 69. Augustin 2. cont. Donat. cap. 7.

By which we may guess, what little relief you are like to have from your second witness S. *Augustine*. Two citations you produce out of him; and, I question not, but to make it appear, that neither of those Testimonies do make for you; and those wery Books afford us sufficient against you.

The

The first is out of his *Books of Christian Doctrine*, which lest we should think not pertinent, you care not to produce it; but we must. *A Man who strengthens himself with Faith, Hope, and Charity, and retains them unshaken, needs not the Scriptures, but only to instruct others, for by these three, many live without Books in a desart.* His meaning is, that he who hath a Principle of Divine Life within him, which discovers it self in the exercise of those three Graces, needs not so much the *external Precepts*, because that inward Principle will carry him to actions suitable to it; only, for convincing or instructing others, these *Books* are continually useful; but for themselves, those good Men who first through the fury of their Persecution were driven, and after others, who, in imitation of that Piety they shewed there, did withdraw into remote places, did live in the exercise of their *Religion* without them. But what is there in all this to infer, that not the *Scriptures* but the Infallibility of the *Church* is the *Foundation of Faith?* Doth St. *Augustine* suppose that Men may have *Faith, Hope, and Charity*, without *believing*: Or, that Men may *believe* without the *Scriptures*, when in the precedent Chapter he hath this remarkable expression concerning *Faith, That it will soon stumble, if the Authority of the sacred Scriptures be weakned:* And doth not this imply that Faith stands on the Authority of the *Scriptures* as its proper foundation? But this were pardonable, if the very design of all that Treatise did not so evidently refute all your *Pretensions*, as nothing can do it more effectually. For can you possibly perswade any reasonable Man to think, that St. *Augustine* dreamt of any such thing, as the *Infallible Testimony* of the *present Church* to be the *ground of Faith*, who when he purposely discourseth concerning the *Christian Doctrine*, the *Principles* of it, and the best *means* to understand it, never so much as mentions any such thing; but on the contrary directs to no other but those you call *Moral and Fallible Means?* For understanding the *Principles of Christian Doctrine*, he shews us the several *natures* of things, some to be enjoyed, some to be used, and others both: That the main thing we are to enjoy is *God*, and therefore begins with him as our last end in whom our happiness lies, and then shews the means to come to this enjoyment of *God*, by explaining the *Principles of Faith* and the efficacy of it. In his second *Book*, he shews how we may come to the sense of *Scripture*, and first discovers the nature of *signs* which represent *things*, and of *letters* which are *signs* of words, and since there are diversities of *tongues*, how necessary the translation of *Scripture* is into them (a good citation for you to justifie your Bibles and Prayers in an unknown language with) and then shews what great reason there was, why there should be some *doubtful* and *obscure places* left in Scripture, *to conquer our Pride by Industry, and to keep the understanding from nauseating, which commonly slights things that are easily understood.* Then shews what preparation and disposition of Soul is requisite for Divine Wisdom, and so comes to the understanding the Scriptures: For which, first is requisite a serious and diligent reading of them; in order to which he must carefully distinguish such as are *Canonical* from such as are not; and for judging of these, he never so much as mentions, much less sends us to the *Infallible Testimony of the* Roman *Church*, but bids us follow *the Authority of the most Catholick Churches among which those are, which are worthy to be call'd Apostolical Sees, and had Epistles sent to them.* What Authority then had

Homo itaq; fide, spe, & charitate subnixus eâq; inconcussè retinens, non indiget scripturis nisi ad alios instruendos. Itaq; multi per hæc tria, etiam in solitudine sine codicibus vivunt. De Doctr. Christianâ. l. 1. cap. 39.

Titubabit autem fides, si divinarum scripturarum vacillat auctoritas. De Doctr. Christ. l. 1. c. 38.

Ad edomandam labore superbiam, & intellectum à fastidio revocandum, cui facilè investigata plerumq; vilescunt, l. 2. c. 6.

In Canonicis autem scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illæ sunt; quæ Apostolicas sedes habere, & epistolas accipere meruerunt, l. 2. c. 8.

the *Church* of *Rome* to judge of *Canonical Scriptures*, more than *Epheſus*, *Philippi*, *Theſſalonica*, &c. To be ſure then, St. *Auguſtine* was not of our Diſcourſer's mind, as to the judgment of *Canonical Books*: And why ſhould he ſend Men to thoſe *Churches* which received the *Epiſtles*, but that there they were like to meet with greater ſatisfaction as to the authenticalneſs of the *Copies* of thoſe *Epiſtles*? After this, he gives directions for underſtanding hard places, *Firſt by diligent reading and remembring the plaineſt places; for in them* (ſaith he) *are found all thoſe things which contain matters of Faith and Practice.* An excellent citation for your ſeveral purpoſes, eſpecially when you would prove the *Obſcurity of Scripture*, the *neceſſity of an Infallible Judge*, or *your Doctrine of Fundamentals* out of St. *Auguſtine*. And then bids them compare obſcure and eaſie places together, to underſtand the *proprieties* of *words*, to get knowledge in the *Tongues*, to compare Verſions, Antecedents and Conſequents, to be skill'd in all humane Arts and Sciences; theſe and ſeveral other inſtructions to the ſame purpoſe are the ſcope of his following Book. Would any one now but *T. C.* have ventured ſo unluckily upon this Treatiſe of St. *Auguſtine* above all others, to prove the *Infallibility* of the *Churches Teſtimony* as neceſſary to *Faith* by? Could any *Proteſtant* have delivered his mind more punctually and plainly than he doth? And can you, or any one elſe that doth but look into that Book, imagine that St. *Auguſtine* ever imagined, that any ſuch thing ſhould ever be thought of in the World, as that the Teſtimony of the *Church of Rome* muſt be owned as the Infallible Foundation of Faith, and the Infallible Interpreter of Scripture? But this it is, to converſe with the *Fathers* only by *retail*, as they are delivered out in *parcels* to you with *directions* upon them, what *uſe* they are for, by *Bellarmine* and ſuch Artiſts as himſelf. This is, inſtead of *quoting* the *Fathers*, to *challenge* them; and you ſee they are not afraid to appear, though to your Shame and Confuſion.

In iis enim quæ apertè poſita in Scripturâ ſunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem, moreſq; vivendi l. 2. c. 9.

But for all this you have a reſerve in St. *Auguſtine* ſtill: Let us ſee what quotation that is, which lies ſo in *Ambuſcado* behind the Hedges, and is ſo loth to come out. There is good reaſon for ſo much *reſervedneſs*; for when we come to ſearch, we find only *Buſhes* inſtead of *Souldiers*. I have throughly examined the place you refer us to, and cannot meet any thing the leaſt pertinent to your purpoſe, unleſs the queſtion of the *lawfulneſs of Hereticks Baptiſm*, prove your *Churches Teſtimony to be Infallible*. But it may be, it is but a venial miſtake of a Chapter or two, forward or backward, and there we may find it. Which when I look into, I cannot but ſuſpect that ſome *Proteſtant* had *trapanned* you into this *Book* and *place* of St. *Auguſtine*; there being ſcarce any Book or place in him more begirt with Arguments againſt you than this is. I was at firſt fearful you had quoted *Fathers at a peradventure*; but upon my further conſidering the place, I ſoon rectified that miſtake. I will therefore reckon you up ſome of the moſt probable Citations out of St. *Auguſtine*'s Books of *Baptiſm againſt the Donatiſts*, and chooſe which of them you pleaſe to prove the neceſſity of an *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church* as a foundation of Faith by? I ſuppoſe, that you intended is in the next Chapter but one following, where St. *Auguſtine* cites that paſſage of *Cyprian*, *That we ought to recur to the Fountain*, i. e. *to Apoſtolical Tradition, and thence derive the channel into our own times*; *this*, ſaith St. Auguſtine, *is the beſt, and without doubt to be done.* No doubt, you think you owe me great thanks for finding out ſo appoſite a place for you, ſo near that you intended; but, before we have done with it, you will

De Baptiſm. c. Donatiſt. l. 5. c. 24.

Quod autem nos admonet, ut ad fontem recurramus, i. e. *ad Apoſtolicam traditionem, & inde canalem in noſtra tempora dirigamus, optimum eſt, & ſine dubitatione faciendum*, l. 5. c. 26.

will see what little reason you have to thank me for it: The place you see is cited by St. *Augustine* out of *Cyprian*, in whose Epistle it is, to *Pompeius* against *Stephanus Bishop of Rome:* We therefore consider, that it was *Stephen* who pleaded Custom and Tradition, to which *Cyprian* replies, *Whence comes this Tradition, doth it descend from the Lord's Authority, or from the Commands and Epistles of the Apostles, for those things are to be done which are there written?* And again, *If it be commanded in the Gospel, or the Epistles, and Acts of the Apostles, then let this holy Tradition be observed.* We see then what St. *Cyprian meant* by his *Apostolical Tradition*, not one Infallibly attested by the present Church, but that is clearly derived from *Scripture* as its fountain: And therefore brings in the foregoing words on purpose to correct the *Errors of Traditions*, that, *As when Channels are diverted to a wrong course, we must have recourse to the fountain; so we must in all pretended Traditions of the Church, run up to the Scriptures as the Fountain head.* And whereas *Bellarmine*'s only shift to avoid this place of *Cyprian*, is, by saying that *Cyprian* argued *more errantium*, i. e. could not defend one error but by another; see how different the judgments of St. *Augustine* and *Bellarmine* are about it: for St. *Augustine* is so far from blaming it in him, that he saith, *Optimum est & sine dubitatione faciendum*, i. e. *It was the best and most prudent course to prevent errors.* And in another place where he mentions that saying of *Cyprian*, *It is in vain for them to object Custom, who are overcome by Reason, as though Custom were greater than Truth; or as though that were not to be followed in spiritual things, which is revealed by the Holy Ghost. This saith St.* Augustine, *is evidently true, because Reason and Truth is to be preferred before Custom.* He doth not charge these sayings on him as *Bellarmine* doth, as part of his *Errors*, but acknowledgeth them, and disputes against his opinion out of those *Principles*. And when before, the *Donatists* objected the Authority of St. *Cyprian* in the point of *Rebaptization*, What kind of answer doth St. *Augustine* give them? The very same that any Protestant would give. *Who knows not that the sacred canonical Scripture of the Old and New Testament is contained within certain bounds; and ought so far to be prefer'd before the succeeding Writings of Bishops, that of that alone we are not to doubt or call in question any thing therein written, whether it be true and right or no.* But, as he saith in the following words, *All the Writings since the confirmation of the Canons of Scripture are liable to dispute, and even Councils themselves to be examined and amended by Councils.* Think you then, that St. *Augustine* ever thought of a present *Infallibility* in the *Church?* Or, if he did, he expressed it in as odd a manner as ever I read: How easily might he have stopt the mouths of the *Donatists* with that one pretence of *Infallibility?* How impertinently doth he dispute through all those *Books*, if he had believed any such thing? It were easie to multiply the Citations out of other Books of St. *Austin*, to shew how much he attributed to *Scripture*, as the only Rule of *Faith*; and consequently, how far from believing your Doctrine of Infallibility. But these may suffice to shew, how unhappily you light on these Books of St. *Augustine* for the proof of your Opinion out of the *Fathers*.

Cypr. ep. 74.

Unde traditio hæc, utrúmne de Dominicâ authoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis & epistolis veniens? Ea enim esse facienda quæ scripta sunt testatur, &c. Si in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum epistolis aut Actibus invenitur, observetur etiam sancta hæc traditio.

Proinde, inquit, frustra quidam qui ratione vincuntur, Consuetudinem nobis objiciunt, quasi consuetudo major sit veritate; aut non id sit in spiritualibus sequendum quod in melius fuerit à Spiritu Sancto revelatum. Hoc planè verum est, quia ratio & veritas consuetudini præponenda est. Aug. de baptism. c. Donat. l. 4. c. 5.

Quis autem nesciat Sanctam Scripturam Canonicam, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti certis suis terminis contineri, eamq; omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum sit, quicquid in eâ scriptum esse constiterit, l. 2. de bapt. c. Donat. cap. 3.

The last thing your Discourser objects against his Lordship's way, is, *If* §. 18.

the

the Church be fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how can I ever be infallibly certain, that she hath not erred de facto, *and defined some Book to be the Word of God, which really is not his Word?* To which I answer. If you mean by *Infallible Certainty*, such a *certainty* as must have some *Infallible Testimony* for the ground of it, you beg the Question: For I deny any such *Infallible Testimony* to be at all requisite for our believing the *Canon* of *Scripture*, and therefore you object that as an inconvenience, which I apprehehend to be none at all. For I do not think it any absurdity to say, that I cannot believe upon some *Infallible Testimony*, that the *Church* hath not *erred* in defining the *Canon of Scripture*. If by *Infallible Certainty* you mean such a *Certainty* as absolutely excludes a *possibility of Deception*; you would do well, first to shew how congruous this is to *humane Nature* in this present state, before you make such a *certainty* so necessary for any act of humane Understanding. But, if by *infallible certainty* you mean only such as excludes all *possibility of reasonable doubting* upon the consideration of the validity and sufficiency of that *Testimony* I am to believe the *Canon* of *Scripture* upon; then I assert, that upon making the *Churches Testimony* to be fallible, it doth not at all follow, but that I may have so great a certainty as excludes the *possibility* of all *reasonable doubting* concerning the *Canon of Scripture*. For when I suppose the *Churches Testimony fallible*, I do not thereby understand, as though there were *as great reason to suspect her deceived, as not*; (nay, I say there can be no reason to suspect her deceived) but by that I understand only this, that the *Church* hath not any *supernatural Infallibility* given her in delivering such a *Testimony*, or that such *Infallibility* must be the foundation of believing the thing so delivered. For whether I suppose your particular *Church of Rome*, or the *Catholick Church* to be *supernaturally Infallible* in her Traditions, there will be the same difficulty returning, and an equal impossibility of vindicating our *Faith* from the Entanglements of a Circle. For still the question unavoidably returns, from whence I believe such a *supernatural Infallibility* in the *Church?* For in that it is *supernatural*, it must suppose some *promise* on which it depends, that *promise* must be somewhere extant, and that can be no where but in *Scripture*; therefore when I am asked, Why I believe the *Canon* of the *Scripture* to be true; if I answer, Because the *Tradition* of the *Catholick Church* is *Infallible*, the question presently returns, Since humane nature is in it self fallible, whence comes the *Church* to have this Infallibility? If I answer, By the *assistance of God's Spirit*, I am presently asked, Since no Man by the light of nature and meer reason can be assured of this; how know you that you are not deceived in believing such an *assistance?* If to this I answer, Because *God* who is Infallible hath made this *Promise* in his *Word*, I am driven again to the *first question*, *How I know this to be God's Word*, and must answer it as before. Upon the *Infallible Testimony of the Catholick Church*. Thus we see, how impossible it is to avoid a *Circle* in the supposition of a *supernatural Infallibility* in the Churches Tradition. But, if no more be meant but a kind of *rational Infallibility*, (though those Terms be not very proper) *i. e.* so *great evidence*, as, if I question it, I may, upon equal grounds, question every thing which Mankind yields the *firmest Assent* to, because I cannot imagine, that so great a part of the *wisest*, and most considerative part of the World should be so grosly deceived in a matter of such moment (especially supposing a *Divine Providence*) then I freely and heartily assert, We have such a kind of *rational Infallibility*; or rather the highest degree of *actual Certainty* concerning the *Truth* of the *Canon of Scripture*; and that the *Catholick Church hath*

hath not de facto *erred in defining it.* Thus I have followed your diſcourſing Chriſtian through all his doubts and perplexities, and upon the reſult, can find no ground at all either of doubting concerning the *Scripture*, or of believing the Teſtimony of your *Church*, or any, to be an *infallible ground of Faith.* Your next paſſage is, to tell us *how his Lordſhips Dedalian windings* (as you finely call them) *are diſintricated:* A happy Man you are at ſquaring Circles, and getting out of *Labyrinths.* And thus it appears in the preſent caſe. For when his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That the Tradition of the Church is too weak, becauſe that is not abſolutely Divine*; you repeat over your already exploded Propoſition, that there may be *an infallible Teſtimony which is not abſolutely Divine*; which, when I have your faculty of writing things, which neither you nor any one elſe can underſtand, I may admit of; but till then, I muſt humbly beg your pardon, as not being able to aſſent to any thing which I cannot underſtand, and have no reaſon to believe. And withal, contrary to your ſecond Anſwer, it appears, *That if the Teſtimony of the Primitive, were abſolutely Divine, becauſe infallible*, the *Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church*, muſt be *abſolutely Divine*, if it be *infallible.* P. 78.

The reſt of this Chapter is ſpent in the examining ſome bye citations of Men of your own ſide chiefly, and therefore it is very little material as to the truth or falſhood of the preſent Controverſie; yet, becauſe you ſeem to triumph ſo much aſſoon as you are off the main buſineſs, I ſhall briefly return an Anſwer to the ſubſtance of what you ſay. His *Lordſhip* having aſſerted *the Tradition of the Primitive Apoſtolical Church to be Divine*, and *that the Church of* England *doth embrace that as much as any Church whatſoever*, withal adds, *That when S.* Auguſtine *ſaid, I would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the Catholick Church moved me*; *ſome of your own will not endure it ſhould be underſtood, ſave of the Church in the time of the Apoſtles only*; *and ſome, of the Church in general, not excluding after Ages: but ſure to include Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* In your Anſwer to this, you inſult ſtrangely over his *Lordſhip* in two things, *Firſt, That he ſhould ſay Some, and mention but one in his Margent.* 2. *That that One doth not ſay, what he cites out of him.* To the *firſt* I anſwer, you might eaſily obſerve, the uſe his *Lordſhip* makes of his *Margent*, is not ſo much to bring clear and diſtinct proofs of what he writes in his Book, but what hath ſome *reference* to what he there ſays: and therefore it was no abſurdity for him to ſay in his Book indefinitely *ſome*, and yet in his Margent only to mention *Occham* For, when his Lordſhip writ that, no doubt his mind was upon *others*, who aſſerted the ſame thing, tho' he did not *load* his Margent with them. And, that you may ſee, I have reaſon for what I ſay, I hope you will not ſuppoſe his Lordſhip unacquainted with the *Teſtimonies* of thoſe of your ſide, who do in terms aſſert this. That I may therefore free you from all kind of ſuſpicion; What think you of *Gerſon*, when, ſpeaking of the greater Authority of the *Primitive Church* than *of the preſent:* he adds, *And by this means we come to underſtand, what S.* Auguſtine *ſaid, I would not believe the Goſpel*, &c. *For there, ſaith he, he takes the Church for the Primitive Congregation of Believers, who ſaw and heard Chriſt, and were witneſſes of what he did.* Is not this Teſtimony plain enough for you? But, beſides this, we have another as evident, in whom are thoſe very words, which his *Lordſhip* by a lapſe P. 81. n. 20.

Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Catholicæ Eccleſiæ commoveret authoritas. Aug. l. 1. c. ep. fund. c. 5.

Ibid. n. 7.

Et ſic aperitur modus intelligendi illud Auguſtini, Evangelio non crederem, niſi me authoritas Eccleſiæ compulliſſet. Ibidem enim Eccleſiam ſumit, pro primitivâ congregatione fidelium eorum, qui Chriſtum viderunt, audierunt, & ſui teſtes fuerunt. Gerſon: lect. 2. *de vitâ ſpirituali an* Coroll. 7.

§. 19.

lapse of memory, attributes to *Occham:* For *Durandus* plainly says, *That for what concerns the approbation of Scripture by the Church, it is understood only of the Church which was in the Apostles times, who were filled with the Holy Spirit, and withal, saw the Miracle of Christ, and heard his Doctrine; and on that account were convenient witnesses of all which Christ did, or taught, that by their Testimony, the Scripture containing the actions and speeches of Christ, might receive approbation.* Do you yet desire a Testimony more express and full, than this is, of one who doth understand the Church exclusively of all successive to the *Apostles*, when he had, just before, produced that known Testimony of S. *Augustine?* You see then, *the Bishop had some reason to say, Some of your Church asserted this to be S.* Augustine's *meaning*; and therefore your Instances of *some*, where but one is meant, are both impertinent and scurrilous. For, where it is evidently known, there was but *one*, it were a *Solœcism* to say *some*; as to say, that *some* of the *Apostles betrayed Christ*, when it is known, that *none* but *Judas* did it. But, if I should say, that *some Jesuits* had writ for the killing of *Kings*, and in the *Margent* should cite *Mariana*, no person conversant in their *writings*, would think it a *Solœcism*; for tho'I produce him for a remarkable Instance, yet that doth not imply, that I have *none* else to produce, but only that the mentioning of *one*, might shew I was not without proof of what I said. For your impudent oblique slander on the memory of that *excellent Prelate Arch-Bishop Cranmer*, when you say, *If a Catholick to disgrace the Protestant Primacy of* Canterbury, *should say, Some of them carried a holy Sister lock'd up in a Chest about with them, and name* Cranmer *only in the Margent*; His memory is infinitely above your slyest detractions; and withal, when you are about such a piece of *Criticism*, I pray, tell me, what doth *some of them* relate to? Is *Primacy* the name of *some Men?* Just as if one should disgrace the *See* of *Rome*, and say, *Some of them have been Atheists, Magicians, debauched*, &c. Tho' I confess, it were a great injury in this case, to cite but *one* in the *Margent*, unless in pity to the Reader; yet, you may sooner vindicate *some of them* from a *Solœcism* in *Language*, when the *See* of *Rome* went before, than *any of them* from those *Solœcisms* in *manners*, which your own Authors have complained of.

Hoc autem quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturæ per Ecclesiam, intelligitur solum de Ecclesiâ quæ fuit tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti Spiritu Sancto, & nihilominus viderunt miracula Christi & audierunt ejus Doctrinam, & ob hoc fuerunt convenientes testes omnium quæ Christus fecit aut docuit, ut per eorum testimonium Scriptura, continens facta & dicta Christi, approbaretur. Durand. l. 3. dist. 24. q. 1. sect. 9.

P. 79. But, say you, *What if this singular-plural say no such thing, as the words alledged by the Bishop signifie?* I have already granted it to have been a very venial mistake of memory in his Lordship of *Occham* for *Durandus*, in whom those very words are which are in the Margent of his Lordships Book, us appears in the Testimony already produced. I acknowledge therefore, that *Occham* in that place of his *Dialogues*, doth speak of the *Catholick Church of all Ages*, comprehending the *Apostles and Evangelists* in it; and in this sense he saith, that place of S. *Augustine* is to be understood. But, what advantage this is to your cause, I cannot imagine. For, what if the *Catholick Church* be taken in that comprehensive sense, to include not only the *Apostles*, but the *Church* successively from their times? Doth it hence follow, *That it is not day tho' the Sun shines?* Or rather, Doth it not follow, That you are not so *quick-sighted* as you would seem to be? And, Whether his Lordship or you come nearer the meaning of *Occham*'s words, let any one judge. For they who speak of the *Church* in that comprehensive sence, do only suppose the *Infallibility* to have been in the *Primitive Apostolical Church*, but the *successive Church* to be only the chanel of *conveyance* of that Testimony down to us, and so they say no more than we do.

Thus

Thus *Driedo* expounds that place of S. *Auguſtine*; *who underſtands it of the Catholick Church, which was from the beginning of the Chriſtian Faith, increaſing according to the courſe of ſucceſſion of Biſhops to theſe times, which Church comprehends in it the College of Apoſtles.* Do you think that theſe Men did believe a *preſent Infallibility* in the *Church?* If ſo, To what end are they ſo careful to carry it ſo high as the *Apoſtles?* Whereas, on your Principle we can have no aſſurance concerning any thing that the *Apoſtles did or ſaid* but only for the *Infallibility of the preſent Church.* You muſt therefore underſtand the *preſent Church* excluſively of the *Apoſtolical Church*; and therefore if S. *Auguſtine* be underſtood in their ſenſe, he is far enough from ſerving your purpoſes. But, ſay you, It is evident, that S. *Auguſtine muſt ſpeak of the Church in his time, becauſe he ſpeaks of that Church which ſaid to him,* Noli credere Manichæo, *which was not true of the Apoſtolical Church?* But, Why might not the *Apoſtolical Church* be a reaſon to S. *Auguſtine*, not to believe *Manichæus*, becauſe he found no footſteps of his Doctrine in the *Records* of that Church? Again, ſuppoſe he means the *preſent Church*, Doth he mean the *infallible Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church?* Might not the Teſtimony of the *Church*, ſuppoſing it fallible, be ſufficient for what S. *Auguſtine* ſaith of it? I doubt it not: And, you ſeem to have no great confidence in this Teſtimony your ſelf, when you add, *That though it be a point of Faith to believe that the Church is infallible, in delivering Scripture to us; yet it is not a point of Faith, that her Infallibility is proved out of the cited place of S.* Auguſtine. *But, when* you ſay, *it is ſufficient that it be clear and manifeſt out of the Text it ſelf,* what text do you mean? S. *Auguſtine*'s, or the *Scriptures?* If St. *Auguſtine*'s, you would do well to ſhew, by what engines you force *Infallibility* out of his words; if the *Scriptures*, What becomes of our *good Motives of Credibility?*

Auguſtinus cum dicit, ego Evangelio, &c. intelligit de Eccleſiâ Catholicâ quæ fuit ab initio Chriſtianæ fidei, ſecundùm ſeriem ſucceſſionis Epiſcoporum creſcens ad hæc uſque tempora, quæ ſanè Eccleſia completitur Collegium Apoſtolorum. Driedo. Tom. 1. l. 4. cap. 4.

When his Lordſhip objects, *That according to your Principles, the Tradition of the preſent Church muſt be as infallible as that of the Primitive,* you very learnedly diſtinguiſh, *That if he means, the one muſt be as truly and really infallible,* quoad ſubſtantiam, *as the other, you grant it: But if he mean, the one muſt be as highly and perfectly infallible, as the other,* quoad modum, *you deny it.* Very good ſtill! It ſeems there are higher and lower degrees in Infallibility. I pray tell us, what that is which is *more than infallible?* The *preſent Church* (you ſay) *is infallible, but not ſo highly and perfectly infallible,* therefore there muſt be *degrees* in *Infallibility*; and ſince the loweſt *degree* is *infallible*, that which is *highly infallible*, muſt be *more* than *infallible.* Again, What difference is there between the *ſubſtance* and the *mode* in *Infallibility?* I had thought, the *ſubſtance of Infallibility* had lain in the *mode*; and I ſhould rather think *Infallibility it ſelf* to be a *mode* of *Apprehenſion*, than talk of *ſubſtance and modes* in it. But, it may be, you mean *ſuch kind of modes of Infallibility, as abſolute and hypothetical.* If you do ſo, explain your ſelf by them; and that we may better underſtand your meaning, ſhew us whether the *Church* be at all capable of *abſolute Infallibility*; if not, What difference there is in *degrees* between the *hypothetical Infallibility of the preſent and Primitive Church,* ſuppoſing both *infallible* in delivering their Teſtimony, and no otherwiſe. For you yet again add, *Of the Churches Teſtimony being infallible, but not ſimply Divine,* but it is the infallible Teſtimony of a deſperate cauſe, to have but one bad ſhift, and to uſe it ſo often.

§. 20. P. 81. n. 21.

P. 80.

Becauſe you would be apt to ſay, That upon his *Lordſhip*'s rejecting the
P. 32. Infallibility of Tradition, he left no uſe at all of it; *He therefore tells you, Notwithſtanding that, it is ſerviceable for very good ends, that it induces Infidels to the reading and conſideration of Scripture, and that it inſtructs novices, and doubters in the Faith; which two ends* (you ſay) *fall ſhort of the end of Tradition; For* (ſay you) *it founds and eſtabliſhes Believers, even the greateſt Doctors of the Church*; for which you cite again this ſame place of S. *Auguſtine*. But did not his *Lordſhip* tell you, that ſome of your own underſtood that very place, *either of Novices or Infidels?* For which, beſides the Teſtimony of ſome of your own party, he adds this reaſon, *becauſe the words immediately before are, If you find one* qui Evangelio nondum credit, *which did not yet believe the Goſpel, What wouldſt thou do to make him believe?* Ego vero non; *&c.* To which you very prudently ſay nothing.

Concerning *Jacobus Almayn's* Opinion, *That we are firſt, and more, bound to believe the Church than the Scripture*; you would ſeem in terms to diſavow it, tho' very faintly; *it is not altogether true*; and hope to ſalve it by a diſtinction of *priority of time and nature*: and you acknowledge, *That in priority of nature we are firſt bound to believe the Church*; and, I ſuppoſe, in priority of *time* too, if we believe the *Scripture for the Churches ſake: Yet, you would not have it ſaid, That we are more bound to believe the Church than Scripture*; but it is not what you would have properly ſaid, but what follows from that antecedent, which *Jacobus Almayn* puts. *It is certain*, ſaith he, *that we are bound to believe all things contained in the Sacred Canon, upon that account alone, becauſe the Church believes them; therefore we are firſt, and more, bound to believe the Church than the Scripture*, which is ſo evident a conſequence, that nothing but ſhame would make you deny it.

Touching *Almayn*'s and *Gerſon*'s reading *compelleret* for *commoveret*, his Lordſhip ſaith, That *Almayn* falſifies the Text notoriouſly; you ſay, *No*; but *you had rather charitably think, they both read it ſo in ſome Copies*; his Lordſhip produceth *a very ancient MS. for the common reading*, you none at all for that, but only the concurrent Teſtimonies of *ſome Schoolmen*, who muſt be confeſſed to be *excellent Criticks*, and well verſed in *ancient MSS.* unleſs where they met with a *little Greek*, or ſome *hard Latin words*; and among whom, the miſtake of one would paſs current for want of examining *Copies*, let the Reader therefore judge, whether Judgment be more probable: But, I think it not worth while to ſay more about it.

In your vindication of the Authority of *Canus*, you make uſe of a very ſilly piece of *Sophiſtry*; for, ſay you, *Though he make Infidels and Novices in the Faith, to be convinced by the Authority of the Church*; *yet, you ſay, It doth not follow, that he makes the ſaid Authority a fallible, but a certain and ſure way to make them believe it.* But, 1. The Queſtion is, Whether *Canus* doth underſtand that place of S. *Auguſtine*, of Infidels and Novices or no? 2. Suppoſe he ſays, *It is a ſure way*, Doth it therefore follow, that it is *an infallible way*? Is nothing *certain* but what is *infallible?* I hope you are *certain* that the *Church of Rome* is the *Catholick Church*; but, Are you *infallible* that ſhe is ſo? If you advance all *certainty* to *Infallibility*, or bring down all *Infallibility* to *Certainty*, every *Chriſtian* is as *infallible* as your *Church* is: For, I make no queſtion, but that every *good Chriſtian* is *certain* of the *Grounds* and *Principles* of his *Religion*. The ſame thing you return upon again (after to little purpoſe you multiply words about *Canus* and *Stapleton*'s Teſtimonies.) For, ſay you, becauſe S. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks of a *ſure way*, therefore he muſt mean an *infallible way*, as though what was not *ſupernaturally infallible*, was preſently *unſure*. I pray, tell me, *Are you ſure that two and two make*

make four? Yet, I hope you will not ſay, You are *ſupernaturally Infallible* that they do ſo. I hope, you are ſure, there is a *Pope* at *Rome*, and a goodly *College* of *Cardinals* there; but, Are you infallible in this? It is not then certainly the ſame, to deny a thing to be *infallible*, and to make it *unſure*: And, you are either very *weak*, or very *wilful*, in ſaying ſo. In what ſenſe this ſo much controverted place of St. *Auguſtine* is to be underſtood, will be afterwards diſcuſſed; and whether it be intended wholly for *Infidels* or no: Only I ſhall take notice now, how, in the *laſt words* of this Chapter, you would again infer *Infallibility* from *undoubted Certainty*, *For*, ſay you, *the Church in St.* Auguſtine's *time*, *eſteemed her ſelf undoubtedly certain, that the Goſpel was the Infallible Word of God; for otherwiſe ſhe might be deceived her ſelf, and deceive others in commanding them to believe that to be God's Word, which was only the word of Man:* But, What is it you would infer from all this? For we believe the *Church* as undoubtedly *certain*, as may be, that the *Scriptures* are *God's Word*; yet we are far enough from believing that her Teſtimony now is *ſupernaturally Infallible.*

CHAP. VII.

The Proteſtant Way of reſolving Faith.

Several Principles premiſed in order to it. The diſtinct Queſtions ſet down, and their ſeveral Reſolutions given. The Truth of Matters of Fact, the Divinity of the Doctrine, and of the Books of Scripture, diſtinctly reſolved into their proper Grounds. Moral Certainty a ſufficient Foundation for Faith, and yet Chriſtian Religion proved to be Infallibly True. How Apoſtolical Tradition made by his Lordſhip a Foundation of Faith. Of the certainty we have of the Copies of Scripture, and the Authority of them. St. Auguſtine's *Teſtimony concerning Church-Authority, largely diſcuſſed and vindicated. Of the private Spirit, and the neceſſity of Grace. His Lordſhip's way of reſolving Faith vindicated. How far Scripture may be ſaid to be known by its own Light. The ſeveral Teſtimonies of* Bellarmine, Brierly, *and* Hooker, *cleared.*

HAving thus far followed you through all your intricacies and windings, and ſhewed, with what diligence and ſubtilty you would juggle Men out of their *Faith*, under a pretence of *Infallibility*; it will be neceſſary for the vindicating our Doctrine, and the clearing this important Controverſie with all evidence and perſpicuity, to lay down thoſe certain grounds which we build our Faith upon. And, although it be one of the greateſt of your Modern Artifices to perſwade the World, that *Proteſtants* have no certain grounds of Faith at all, yet I doubt not but to make it evident, that the way taken by the moſt judicious and conſiderative *Proteſtants*, is as ſatisfactory and reaſonable, as I have already made it appear, that yours is unreaſonable and ridiculous. Which I ſhall the rather do, becauſe through the want of a clear and diſtinct apprehenſion of the true way of reſolving Faith, no Controverſie in Religion hath been more obſcure and involved, than this hath been. Therefore for our more diſtinct method of proceeding, I ſhall firſt endeavour to prevent Miſunderſtanding, by premiſing ſeveral things which are neceſſary for a through opening the ſtate of the Controverſie, and then come to the reſolution of it. The things then I would premiſe, are theſe following: §. 1.

1. That we enquire not after the *reaſon, why we aſſent to what is divinely revealed*, but after the *reaſon why we believe any thing to be a Divine Revelation*. Therefore when Men ſpeak of the *laſt reſolution of Faith* into the *Veracity* of *God* revealing, they ſpeak that which is undoubtedly true, but it reacheth not our preſent enquiry. I freely grant, that the *ultimate reaſon* why any thing is believed, is upon the *Teſtimony* of him from whom it comes; and the greater the knowledge and fidelity is, of him whoſe Teſtimony I believe, the *ſtronger* my *Aſſent* is, ſuppoſing I have ſufficient evidence that it is his Teſtimony. But that is not our preſent Queſtion; for it being taken for granted among all *Chriſtians*, that *God's Teſtimony* is *abſolutely Infallible*, there can no diſpute ariſe concerning the ground of reſolving *Faith*, ſuppoſing *God's Revelation* to be ſufficiently known. For no one queſtions but *God's Veracity*, however diſcovered, is a ſufficient ground for Faith; but all the queſtion is, How we come to know wherein this *Veracity* of *God* doth diſcover it ſelf; or what thoſe things are which are immediately revealed by him. Therefore to tell us, that the *reſolution* of *Faith* is into *God's Infallible Teſtimony*, without ſhewing on what account this Teſtimony is to be believed to be from *God*, is, to tell us that which no one doubts of, and to eſcape that which is the main queſtion. For in caſe *Iſaac* ſhould have denied ſubmiſſion to his *Father's* Will when he went to be ſacrificed, till he could be ſatisfied concerning the lawfulneſs of that action which his *Father* went about; Do you think it had been ſatisfactory to him, if *Abraham* had told him, that *God* had power to relax his own *Laws*, and therefore he need not queſtion the lawfulneſs of the action; might not *Iſaac* have preſently anſwered, That he did not queſtion, but what *God* commanded was lawful, but that he deſired, was, ſome evidence that he had a *Revelation* for what he did. And the anſwer to this had been only pertinent and ſatisfactory. So that he might have no reaſon to queſtion it, although he did not believe any thing more than common Fidelity in his *Father's* Teſtimony. For *God* never, (when Revelations were moſt common) thought it neceſſary to multiply *Revelations* ſo far, as to make one neceſſary to atteſt another; but that *Revelation* which was communicated to one was obligatory to all concerned in it, though they could have nothing but *Moral Certainty* for it. By this it appears, that when we now ſpeak of the *Reſolution* of *Faith*, though the *utmoſt reaſon* of our aſſent is, that *Infallibility* which is ſuppoſed in *Divine Teſtimony*, yet the neareſt and moſt proper reſolution of it, is, into the grounds inducing us to believe that ſuch a Teſtimony is *truly Divine*, and the *reſolution* of this cannot be into any Divine Teſtimony without a Proceſs *in infinitum*.

2. That when we ſpeak of the *reſolution of Faith*, by *Faith* we underſtand a *rational* and *diſcurſive Act* of the Mind. For *Faith* being an *aſſent* upon *Evidence*, or *Reaſon* inducing the Mind to aſſent, it muſt be a *rational* and *diſcurſive Act*; and ſuch a one that one may be able to give an account of to another. And this account which Men are able to give why they do believe, or on what ground they do it, is that which we call *reſolving Faith*. And by this it appears, that whatever reſolves *Faith* into its *efficient cauſe*, (which ſome improperly call *the Teſtimony of the Spirit*) though it may be true, yet comes not home to the queſtion. For if by the *Teſtimony of the Spirit* be meant that *Operation* of the *Spirit* whereby ſaving *Faith* is wrought in us, then it gives no account from the *thing* to be believed, why we *aſſent* to it, but only ſhews how *Faith* is wrought in us by way of *Efficiency*; which is rather reſolving the Queſtion *about the neceſſity of Grace* than the

grounds

grounds of Faith. Our question is not then, concerning the necessity of *infused habits of Grace*, but of those *rational Inducements* which do incline the Mind to a firm assent. For *Faith* in us, however it is wrought, being a *Perswasion* of the Mind, it is not conceivable how there should be any *discursive Act* of the Mind, without some *reason* causing the Mind to assent to what is propounded to it? For without this, Faith would be an unaccountable thing, and *the Spirit of Revelation* would not be *the Spirit of Wisdom*; and *Religion* would be exposed to the contempt of all unbelievers, if we were able to give no other account of Faith, than that it is wrought in us by the *Spirit of God.* When we speak therefore of the *resolving Faith*, we mean, what are the *rational Inducements to believe*, or what evidence there is in the Object propounded to make us firmly assent to it.

3. *According to the different Acts of Faith, there must be assigned a different resolution of Faith.* For every Act being *rational* and discursive, must have its proper *grounds* belonging to it; unless we suppose that Act elicited without any *reason* for it, which is incongruous with the nature of the humane Understanding,

§. 2. There are then in the question of *resolution of Faith*, these three questions to be resolved. First, *Why I believe those things to be true which are contained in the Book called the Scripture?* 2. *Why I believe the Doctrine contained in that Book to be Divine?* 3. *Why I believe the Books themselves to be of Divine Revelation?* Now every one of these *questions* admits of a different *way* of *Resolution*; as will appear by the handling each of them distinctly.

1. If I be asked, *On what grounds I believe the things to be true which are contained in Scripture*, my answer must be, From the *greatest evidence of truth*, which things of that nature are capable of. If therefore the *Persons* who are supposed to have writ these things, were *such* who were fully acquainted with what they writ of; if they were such *Persons* who cannot be suspected of any design to *deceive* Men by their *Writings*; and if I be certain that these which go under the *name* of their *Writings*, are undoubtedly theirs; I must have sufficient *grounds* to believe the truth of them. Now that the *writers of these things cannot be suspected of Ignorance*, appears by the *time* and *age* they writ in, when the *story* of these things was new, and such multitudes were willing enough to have *contradicted* it, if any thing had been amiss: Besides, *some* of the *writers* had been intimately conversant with the *Person* and *actions* of him whom they writ most of. *That they could have no intent to deceive*, appears from the *Simplicity* and *Candour* both of their *Actions* and *Writings*, from their *contempt* of the World, and exposing themselves to the greatest *hazards* to bear witness to them. *That these are the very same writings*, appears by all the *evidence* can be desired; For we have as great, if not much greater *reason* to believe them to be the *Authors* of the *Books* under their *Names*, than any other *writers* of any *Books* whatsoever, both because the *matters* are of greater *moment*, and therefore Men might be supposed more *inquisitive* about them; and that they have been unanimously received for theirs from the very *time* of their being first written, (except some very few, which upon strict examination were admitted too) and we find these very *Books* cited by the learned *Christians* under these Names in that time, when it had been no difficulty to have found out several of the Original *Copies* themselves. When therefore they were universally received by *Christians*, never doubted of by the *Jews*, or *Heathen Philosophers*: We have as great evidence for this *first Act of Faith*, as it is capable of. And he is unreasonable who desires more.

2. *If*

2. *If I be asked, why I believe the Doctrine contained in these Books to be Divine?* I must give in two things for answer. 1. *That in the Age when the Doctrine was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it Divine.* 2. *That if there was sufficient reason then, we have sufficient reason now.*

1. *That in the Age when the Doctrine was delivered, there was sufficient reason to believe it Divine*; Supposing then, that we already believe upon the former answer, that all *the Matters of Fact* be true. I answer, that if *Christ* did such unparallel'd *Miracles*, and rose from the Dead, they who heard his *Doctrine* had reason to believe it to be of *God*: And this I suppose the greatest *Infidel* would not deny, if himself had been one of the *witnesses* of his *Actions* and *Resurrection*.

2. *That if they had reason then, we have so now*; because Tradition to us doth only supply the want of our *Senses*, as to what *Christ* did and spake; *i. e.* That *Tradition* is a kind of *derivative* and *perpetuated Sensation* to us; it being of the same use to *us* now which our *Eyes* and *Ears* had been, if we had been actually present when *Christ* delivered his Doctrine and wrought his Miracles. Which that we may better understand, we may consider what the use of our *Senses* had been, if we had been then present; and consequently what the *use* of *Tradition* is now to us. Now it is apparent, that the use of the *Senses*, to those *who saw the Miracles and heard the Doctrine of Christ*, was not to give any *Credibility* to either of them, but only to be the *means* of conveying to them those things which might induce them to believe; the same doth *Tradition* now to us, it doth not in it self make the *Doctrine* more *credible*, but supplies the use of our *Senses* in a certain conveyance of those things to us which were the *Motives* to believe them. For the *Motives* to *Faith* both to them and us are the same, only the manner of conveyance is different; but our case is much the same with those who lived in the same *Age*, but by reason of distance of *place* could not be personally present at what *Christ did* or *said*; now if those *Persons* were *obliged* to *believe*, and had sufficient *reason* for *Faith*, who by reason of *distance of place* could not exercise their *Senses* about *Christ's Doctrine* and *Miracles*, the same *reason* and *obligation* have we, who cannot do it by reason of *distance of time*. And if there be any advantage on either side, it is on ours, because though the *Tradition* doth not in it self give any *Credibility* to the *Doctrine*, yet there are such *circumstances* accompanying this Tradition, which may much facilitate our belief above *theirs*: Because by such a continued Tradition we have an evidence of the *efficacy* of this *Doctrine*, which had so continual a *power* as to engage so many in all *Ages* since its first appearance to be the propagators and defenders of it. And therefore this hath very much the advantage of the *report* of any *credible Persons* in that *Age*, who might report to any at distance the *Miracles* and *Doctrine of Christ*. And this is the way of resolution of Faith, which the Scripture it self directs us to. *How shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him: God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with diverse miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?* Where we plainly see, the *resolution of Faith* as to the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* was into the *Miracles* wrought for the confirmation of it, (which was the proper *witness* or *testimony of the Holy Ghost*) but the means of conveyance was by the *Tradition* of those who were *eye* and *ear-witnesses* of what *Christ* said or did. As therefore it was not supposed necessary for them who saw the *Miracles* of *Christ*, either to have some *inward Testimony* of the *Spirit*, or some external *Infallible Testimony* of the *Church*,

Heb. 2. 3, 4.

to

to aſſure them that theſe *miracles* were really done by *Chriſt*, but *God* left them to the judgment of *ſenſe*; ſo proportionably neither of thoſe *two* is now neceſſary for the *reſolution of our Faith*, but *God* inſtead of the judgement of *ſenſe* leaves us to the evidence of *Tradition*.

Object. *But all this is* (you ſay) *no more than Moral certainty, which being fallible, we cannot from thence be aſſured that Chriſtian Religion is Infallibly true? Anſw.* This being the great *bug-bear* wherewith you would fright Men out of their *Religion*, I ſhall in this place ſhew, that it ſerves only to ſcare fools and children with. For, 1. What greater *certainty* had they who lived in the time of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and did not ſee their *Miracles?* Had they, or could they have, any more than this you call *moral Certainty?* and, Do you really think, that all ſuch could not be ſufficiently aſſured, that *Chriſtian Religion* was infallibly true? 2. *Moral Certainty* may be a ſufficient Foundation for the moſt *firm Aſſent*; and therefore, if the matter to be believed be the *infallible Truth* of a *Doctrine* upon *ſuitable evidence*, though we have now but *moral Certainty* of that evidence, the *Aſſent* may be firm to ſuch a *Doctrine* as infallible. And therefore the grand miſtake lies here, as tho' our *Faith* were reſolved finally into this *moral Certainty*; or, as if the Faith of thoſe who ſaw *Chriſt*'s *Miracles*, were reſolved into their *eyes*, and not into the *Miracles*; for as their *eyes* were but the *means* of conveyance of that *evidence* which was *infallible*, ſo is that *Tradition* to us by which we have our *Certainty* of thoſe evidences of the *infallible Truth* of *Chriſtian Religion*. And we are further to conſider that the nature of *Certainty* is not ſo much to be taken from the *matters themſelves*, as from the *grounds* inducing the *Aſſent*; that is, Whether the *things* be *Mathematical*, *Phyſical*, or *Moral*; if there be no *reaſon* to *queſtion* the *grounds* of belief, the caſe is all one as to the nature of the *Aſſent*. So that *moral Certainty* may be as *great* as *Mathematical* and *Phyſical*, ſuppoſing as little reaſon to *doubt* in *moral things* as to their *natures*, as in *Mathematical* and *Phyſical* as to theirs. Therefore this great quarrel about *moral Certainty* is very unreaſonable; unleſs it be proved, that there is no cauſe of *firm Aſſent* upon *moral grounds*; now, if the *cauſe* of the *Aſſent* may be, as *equal* and *proportionable* to their *nature* in *moral things*, as in *Mathematical*; there may be as *firm* an *Aſſent* in the *One*, as in the *Other*, as I have already ſhewed. For which, this *reaſon* is plain and evident, that *Certainty* implies the taking away all *ſuſpicion of doubt*: But there can be no taking away all *ſuſpicion of doubt* in *Mathematical* things, without *Mathematical evidence*; but in *moral things*, all ſuſpicion of *doubt* is removed upon *moral evidence*, and therefore the *Certainty* may be as great in the Aſſent to one as the other. Thus, we ſee, how unjuſtly, and how much to the diſhonour of Religion you quarrel with *moral evidence*, as an uncertain thing. But, I anſwer yet further, 3. *That the greateſt aſſurance we can deſire, that any Religion is infallibly True, is from moral Certainty*; and that upon theſe three grounds. 1. *Becauſe the grounds of all Religion are capable of no more.* 2. *Becauſe the higheſt evidence of any Religion muſt depend upon it.* 3. *Becauſe this, in it ſelf, may evidently demonſtrate, that Chriſtian Religion is infallibly True.* §. 3.

1. *There can be no greater than this moral Certainty of the main Foundations of all Religion*, which are, The *Being of God*, and *Immortality of ſouls*; without the ſuppoſition of which, there can be no ſuch thing as Infallibility in the world; and therefore from thence I may eaſily prove, that there can be no more than moral *Certainty* of the exiſtence of a *Deity*. For, if the very notion of Infallibility doth ſuppoſe a *God*, then you canot infallibly

fallibly prove that there is *One*, (in your ſenſe of Infallibility) for then you muſt beg the Queſtion, and ſuppoſe that already to be, which you are proving the *exiſtence* of : Now that, *Infallibility* in us doth ſuppoſe the *exiſtence of God*, appears moſt evidently, becauſe, Man's underſtanding being of it ſelf fallible, it cannot be ſuppoſed in any thing infallible, without the *ſupernatural Aſſiſtance* of a *being Infallible*, which can be nothing elſe but *God*. But, if you think you have *infallible proofs*, produce them, and convince the world of *Atheiſts* by them: We acknowledge we have as great *evidence* and *certainty*, as humane nature is capable of, a *Being* of ſuch a *Nature* as *God* is, from the conſideration of his works; but all this ſtill is *moral Certainty*; for the grounds are neither *Mathematically demonſtrative*, nor *ſupernaturally infallible*. What folly and madneſs then is it for your party to cry out ſo much againſt *moral Certainty in Religion*, when the *Foundation* of all *Religion* is capable of no more; And may not this juſtly increaſe our ſuſpicion, that under *moral Certainty* you ſtrike at the Foundation of all Religion?

2. *Suppoſe God give the moſt infallible evidence of any Religion, it is not poſſible, but that ſome who are bound to believe that Religion, can have any more than moral Certainty of it.* And, for all that I know the greateſt *Phyſical Certainty* is as liable to queſtion as *moral*; there being as great a *poſſibility of Deception* in that, as a *ſuſpicion of doubt* in this, and oft-times greater. What advantage then had thoſe who ſtood by, and ſaw the *miracles* of *Moſes* and *Chriſt*, above thoſe who did not, but had the report of them conveyed to them in an unqueſtionable manner? Beſides, it is apparent, *God's* great aim in any *Religion*, is moſt at the good of thoſe who can have only a *moral Certainty* of the great *evidences* of the *Truth* of that *Religion*; becauſe it being *God's* intention, that the *Religion* delivered by Him, ſhould be not meerly for the benefit of thoſe very few perſons who could be preſent at ſuch things, but for the advantage of thoſe incomparably greater numbers, who, by reaſon of *diſtance* of *place and age*, could not be preſent; it would argue a ſtrange want of *proviſion* for Men's *Faith*, unleſs *moral Certainty* were ſufficient. Only you indeed will ſuppoſe that which *God* himſelf never thought neceſſary, *viz. an infallible Teſtimony of the preſent Church*; but to what good purpoſes you have introduced this, hath largely appeared already.

3. *Moral Certainty yields us ſufficient Aſſurance, that Chriſtian Religion is infallibly true:* And that I prove, becauſe *moral Certainty* may evidently ſhew us the *Credibility* of the *Chriſtian Religion*, which you deny not, nor any elſe; and, that from the *Credibility* of it, the *infallible Truth* of it may be proved, will appear by theſe two things:

1. *That where there is evident Credibility in the matter propounded, there doth ariſe upon Men an obligation to believe:* And that is proved both by your own confeſſion (as to the *Churches Infallibility* being believed on the *Motives of Credibility*) and from *God's Intention*, in giving ſuch *Motives*, which was, to perſwade them to believe, as appears by multitudes of *places* of *Scripture*; and withal, tho' the meer *Credibility* of the *Motives* might at firſt ſuppoſe ſome *doubts* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine*, yet it is not conſiſtent with any doubt, as to the *Infallibility* of the *obligation to believe*; becauſe there can be no other reaſon aſſigned of theſe *Motives of Credibility*, than the inducing on Men an *obligation* to *Faith*.

2. *That where there is ſuch an obligation to believe, we have the greateſt aſſurance, that the matter to be believed is infallibly True:* Which depends upon this manifeſt proof, *That God cannot oblige Men to believe a lye*; it being repug-

nant

hant to all our conceptions of the *Veracity* and *Goodneſs of God*, to imagine, that *God* ſhould require from Men (on the pain of *eternal damnation*, for not believing) to believe ſomething as *infallibly True*, which is really falſe. Thus, you ſee, what a clear and pregnant demonſtration we have of the *infallible Truth of Chriſtian Religion* from *moral Certainty*; How injurious then have thoſe of your party been, who have charged this opinion of believing upon *moral Certainty*, with betraying *Religion*, and denying *Chriſtian Religion* to be *infallibly True?* Thus much for this grand Objection; I now come to the laſt Queſtion conſiderable in the Reſolution.

3. *On what account do I believe theſe particular Books of Scripture to be God's Word?* Which may admit of a double ſenſe: 1. *On what account I do believe the Doctrine contained in theſe Books to be God's Word?* 2. *On what account I do believe the Books containing this Doctrine to be God's Word?* As to the *firſt*, I have anſwered already, *viz.* Upon the ſame *rational evidence* which *God* gave, that the *Teſtimony* of thoſe who delivered, was a *Divine* and *infallible Teſtimony:* To the ſecond, I anſwer in theſe two Propoſitions: §. 4.

1. That the *laſt Reſolution of Faith* is not into the *Infallibility of the Inſtrument of conveyance*, but into the *Infallibility of that Doctrine*, which is thereby conveyed to us. For the writing of this *Doctrine* is only the *condition* by which this *Revelation* is made manifeſt to us; it being evident from the *nature* of the thing, that the *writing* of a *Divine Revelation* is not neceſſary for the *ground* and *reaſon of Faith*, as to that Revelation: becauſe Men may believe a *Divine Revelation* without it; as is not only evident in the caſe of the *Patriarchs*, but of all thoſe, who in the time of *Chriſt*, and the *Apoſtles*, did believe the truth of the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* before it was written. If therefore the *writing* be only the *condition* of the *manifeſtation* of the *Object* in a *certain* way to us, the *ground* and *reaſon* of *Faith*, is not to be reſolved into *that* which is only the *mode* of our knowledge of the Object to be believ'd; but into *that* which is properly the *ground* and *reaſon* why we believe that *Doctrine* or *Revelation* to be *Divine*, which is contained in thoſe Books. And this is ſtill the caſe of all illiterate *perſons*, who cannot reſolve their *Faith* properly into the *Scripture*, but into the *Doctrine* delivered them out of *Scripture*. Hence we may diſcern the difference between the *Formal Object*, and the *Rule of Faith*; the *Formal Object* is that evidence which is given of the *Infallibility* of the *Teſtimony* of thoſe who delivered the Doctrine; the *infallible Rule of Faith*; to us, is the *Scripture*, *viz.* that which limits and bounds the *material objects* of Faith, which we are bound to believe; and this doth therefore diſcover to us what thoſe things are, which on the account of the *Formal Object*, we are obliged to believe.

2. *Thoſe who believe the Doctrine of Scripture to be Divine, have no reaſon to queſtion the infallible conveyance of that Doctrine to us, in thoſe Books we call the Scripture.* Therefore, whatever things we are to believe in order to ſalvation, we have as great evidence as we can deſire, that they are *infallibly* conveyed to us.

1. *If the Doctrine of Chriſt be True and Divine, then all the Promiſes he made were accompliſhed:* Now, that was one of the greateſt, *That his Spirit ſhould lead his Apoſtles into all Truth*; Can we then reaſonably think, that if the *Apoſtles* had ſuch an *infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Spirit* of *God* with them, in what they ſpake in a tranſitory way to them who heard them, that they ſhould want it in the delivering thoſe *Records* to the *Church*, which were to be the ſtanding *monument* of this Doctrine to all *Ages* and *Generations*. If *Chriſt's Doctrine* therefore be True, the *Apoſtles* had an infallible *Aſſiſtance* of *God's Spirit*; if they had ſo in delivering the *Doctrine of Chriſt* by preach- Joh. 16. 13.

ing, nothing can be more unreaſonable, than to imagine ſuch ſhould want it, who were employed to give an account to the world of the *nature* of this *Doctrine*, and of the *Miracles* which accompanied *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*. So that, it will appear an abſurd thing to aſſert, that the *Doctrine of Chriſt* is *Divine*, and to queſtion, whether we have the *infallible Records* of it. It is not pertinent to our Queſtion, in what way the *Spirit of God* aſſiſted them that wrote, Whether by immediate *ſuggeſtion* of all ſuch things which might be ſufficiently known without it; and whether in ſome things which were not of concernment, it might not leave them to their own judge-
Joh. 6. 19. ment; (as in that place, *When they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs*, when, no doubt, *God's Spirit* knew infallibly whether it was, but thought not fit to reveal it) whether in ſome lighter circumſtances the Writers were ſubject to any inadvertencies (the negative of which is more piouſly credible) whether meer *hiſtorical paſſages* needed the ſame infallible Aſſiſtance; that *Prophetical* and *Doctrinal*; theſe things, I ſay, are not neceſſary to be reſolved, it being ſufficient in order to *Faith*, that the *Doctrine* we are to believe, as it was infallibly delivered to the world, by the preaching of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, ſo it is infallibly conveyed to us in the *Books of Scripture*.

2. *Becauſe theſe Books were owned for Divine by thoſe Perſons and Ages, who were moſt competent Judges, whether they were ſo or no.* For the Age of the *Apoſtles* was ſufficiently able to judge, whether thoſe *things* which are ſaid to be ſpoken by *Chriſt*, or written by the *Apoſtles*, were really ſo or no. And we can have no reaſon at all to queſtion, but what was delivered by them, was infallibly true. Now, from that *firſt Age* we derive our *knowledge* concerning the *Authority* of theſe *Books*, which being conveyed to us in the moſt *unqueſtionable* and *univerſal Tradition*, we can have no reaſon in the world to doubt, and therefore the *greateſt reaſon* firmly to *aſſent*, that the *Books* we call the *Scripture*, are the *infallible Records* of the *Word of God*. And thus much may ſuffice in general concerning the Proteſtant Way of reſolving Faith: I now return to the examination of what you give us by way of anſwer to his Lordſhips diſcourſe.

The firſt Aſſault you make upon his Lordſhip, is, for making *Apoſtolical Tradition a ground of Faith*: but becauſe your peculiar excellency lies in the involving plain things; the beſt ſervice I can do, is to lay things open as they are; by which means we ſhall eaſily diſcern where the truth lies. I ſhall therefore firſt ſhew, how far his Lordſhip makes *Apoſtolical Tradition a ground of Faith*, and then conſider what you have to object againſt it. In
Sect. 16. n. 20. that Section which your Margent refers to, all that he ſays of it, is, *That the Voice and Tradition of that Church which included in it Apoſtles, Diſciples, and ſuch as had immediate Revelation from Heaven, was Divine, and the Word of God from them is of like validity written or delivered, And, as to this Tradition* (ſaith he) *there is abundance of Certainty in it ſelf, but how far it*
P. 84. *is evident to us, ſhall after appear.* At the end of the next *n.* 21. he ſaith, *That there is double Authority, and both Divine, that confirms Scripture to be the Word of God. Tradition of the Apoſtles delivering it, and the internal worth and argument in the Scripture, obvious to a ſoul prepared by the preſent*
P. 85. *Churches Tradition, and God's Grace.* But, *n.* 23. he ſaith, *That this Apoſtolical Tradition is not the ſole and only means to prove Scripture Divine, but the moral perſwaſion, reaſon, and force of the preſent Church, is ground enough for any one to read the Scripture, and eſteem reverently of it. And this once done, the Scripture hath then In and home-arguments enough to put a ſoul that hath but ordinary Grace, out of doubt, that the Scripture is the Word of God, infallible and*

and Divine. I ſuppoſe his Lordſhip's meaning may be comprized in theſe particulars. 1. That to thoſe who lived in the *Apoſtolical* Times, the *Tradition of Scripture*, by thoſe who had an infallible Teſtimony, was a ſufficient ground of their believing it infallibly true. 2. That though the *conveyance* of that *Tradition* to us be not infallible, yet it may be ſufficient to raiſe in us a high eſteem and veneration for the *Scripture.* 3. That thoſe who have this *eſteem* for the *Scripture*, by a through ſtudying and conſideration of it, may undoubtedly believe that *Scripture* is the *Divine* and *Infallible* Word of *God.* This I take to be the ſubſtance of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe. We now come to examine what you object againſt him. *Your firſt demand is, How comes Apoſtolical Primitive Tradition to work upon us, if the preſent Church be fallible?* Which I ſhall anſwer by another, How come the *Decrees of Councils* to work upon you, if the reporters of thoſe *Decrees* be fallible? If you ſay, *It is ſufficient that the Decree it ſelf be infallible, but it is not neceſſary that the reporter of thoſe Decrees ſhould be ſo*; The ſame I ſay concerning the *Apoſtolical Tradition* of *Scripture*, though it were *Infallible* in their *Teſtimony*, yet it is not neceſſary that the conveyance of it to us ſhould be *Infallible.* And if you think your ſelf bound to believe the Decrees of *General Councils* as *Infallible*, though fallibly conveyed to you; Why may not we ſay the ſame concerning *Apoſtolical Tradition?* Whereby you may ſee, though Tradition be *fallible*, yet the matter conveyed by it, may have its proper effect upon us. Your next Enquiry (if I underſtand it) is to this ſenſe, *Whether Apoſtolical Tradition be not then as credible as the Scriptures?* I anſwer freely (ſuppoſing it equally evident) what was delivered by the *Apoſtles* to the Church by word or writing, hath equal *Credibility:* You attempt to prove, *That there is equal evidence, becauſe the Scripture is only known by the Tradition of the Church, to be the ſame that was recommended by the Apoſtolical Church, which you have likewiſe for Apoſtolical Tradition.* But, 1. Do you mean the ſame *Apoſtolical Tradition* here or no, which the *Archbiſhop ſpeaks of, i. e.* that Act of the *Apoſtles*, whereby they delivered the *Doctrine of Chriſt* upon their *Teſtimony* to the World? If you mean this Tradition, for my part, I do not underſtand it as any thing really diſtinct from the *Tradition* of the *Scripture* it ſelf. For, although I grant, that the *Apoſtles* did deliver that Doctrine by *Word* as well as *Writing*, yet if that *Tradition* by *Word* had been judged ſufficient, I much queſtion whether we had ever had any written *Records* at all. But, becauſe of the ſpeedy decay of an Oral *Tradition*, if there had been no ſtanding *Records*, it pleaſed *God* in his infinite *Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs*, to ſtir up ſome fit Perſons to digeſt thoſe things ſummarily into writing, which otherwiſe would have been expoſed to ſeveral Corruptions in a ſhort time. For we ſee preſently in the *Church*, notwithſtanding this, how ſuddenly the *Gnoſticks*, *Valentinians*, *Manichees* and others, did pretend ſome *ſecret Tradition* of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* diſtinct from their writings. When therefore you can produce as certain evidence for any *Apoſtolical Tradition* diſtinct from *Scripture*, as we can do, that the *Books* of *Scripture* were delivered by the *Apoſtles* to the *Church*, you may then be hearkened to, but not before. 2. We have other ways to judge of the *Identity* of the *Copies* of Scripture (which we have) with thoſe delivered by the Primitive *Church*, beſides the *Teſtimony* of the *preſent Church.* And the judgment of the *preſent Church* conſidered meerly as ſuch, can be no argument to ſecure any Man concerning the Integrity and Incorruption of the *Books* of *Scripture.* We do therefore juſtly appeal to the ancient *Copies*, and *MSS.* which confirm the Incorruption of ours. But, ſay you, *What infallible Certainty have we of them, beſide Church Tradition?* P. 82. P. 83.

Very wisely said in several respects, as though no *Certainty* less than *Infallible*, could serve Men's turns as to ancient *Copies* of *Scripture*, and as though your *Church* could give Men *Infallible Certainty* which *Copies* were ancient, and which were not. But for our parts, we should not be at all nearer any *Certainty*, much less *Infallibility* concerning the *Authenticalness of any ancient Copies*, because your *Church* declared it self for them; neither can we imagine it at all necessary in the examination of *ancient Copies* to have any *Infallible Certainty* at all of them. For as well you may pretend it as to any other Authors, when all that we look after in such *Copies* is only that evidence which things of that nature are capable of. But you make his *Lordship* give as wise an answer to this question of yours; *They may be examined and approved by the authentical Autographa's of the very Apostles.* Where is it that this answer is given by his *Lordship?* If you may be allowed to make questions and answers too, no doubt, the one will be as wise as the other. But I suppose you thought, nothing could be said pertinent in this case, but what you make his Lordship say: And then by the unreasonableness of that answer, because none of these *Autograph's* are supposed extant, and because if they were so, all Men could not be *Infallibly certain* of them, you think you have sufficient advantage against your Adversary, because thereby it would appear there can be no certainty of *Scripture* but from the *Authority* of your *Church*. To which because it may seem to carry on your great design of rendring *Religion* uncertain, I shall return a particular answer.

§. 6. 1. Supposing we could have no *Certainty* concerning the *Copies* of *Scripture* but from *Tradition*, this doth not at all advantage your *Cause*, unless you could prove, that no other *Tradition* but that of your *Church* can give us any certainty of it. Give me leave then to make this Supposition, That *God* might not have given this *supernatural Assistance to your Church*, which you pretend makes it *Infallible*, Whether Men through the *universal consent* of Persons of the *Christian Church* in all *Ages*, might not have been undoubtedly certain, That the *Scripture* we have, was the same delivered by the *Apostles? i. e.* Whether a *matter of fact*, in which the whole *Christian World* was so deeply engaged, that not only their Credit, but their Interest was highly concerned in it, could not be attested by them in a credible manner? Which is as much as to ask, Whether the whole *Christian* World was not at once besotted and infatuated in the grossest manner, so as to suffer the *Records* of those things which concerned their eternal welfare, to be imbezled, falsified, or corrupted, so as to mistake them for *Apostolical Writings*, which were nothing so. If it be not then credible, that the *Christian World* should be so monstrously imposed upon, and so grosly deceived, then certainly the *Universal Tradition of this Society* may yield unquestionable evidence to any inquisitive Person, as to the *Integrity* and *Incorruption* of the *Body* of *Scriptures*. And if it may yield such *evidence*, why doth it not so? When we see this was the very case of the Christian World in all *Ages*. Some *Writings* were delivered to the *Church* of the Age they lived in, by the *Apostles*; these *Writings* were so delivered, as that the *Christians* understood they were of things of more *concernment* to them than the *whole World* was; *these Writings* were then received, embraced, and publickly read; *these Writings* were preserved by them so sacred and inviolable, that it was accounted a crime of the highest nature to deliver the *Copies* of them into the hands of the *Heathen Persecutors*; *these Writings* were still owned by them as *Divine*, and the *Rule* and *Standard of Faith*, *these* were appealed to in all Disputes among them, *these* were *preserved* from the *attempts* of *Hereticks*.

ticks, *vindicated* from the *Aſſaults* of the moſt *learned Infidels*, *tranſcribed* into the *Books* of the moſt diligent *Chriſtians*, *tranſmitted* from one *Generation* to another, as the moſt ſacred *depoſitum* of *Heaven*; And yet is it poſſible, to ſuppoſe that theſe *writings* ſhould be extorted out of their *hands* by *violence*, *abuſed* under their *eyes* by *fraud*, or *ſuffered* to be loſt by *negligence*. Yet no other way can be imagined, why any ſhould ſuſpect the *Books* of *Scripture* which we have are not the ſame with thoſe delivered by the *Apoſtles*. All which are ſuch unreaſonable *Suppoſitions*, that they could hardly enter into any *head* but *yours*, or *ſuch* whoſe cauſe you manage in theſe diſputes; the moſt profligate *Atheiſts*, or moſt unreaſonable *Scepticks*. If then we entertain but mean and ordinary thoughts of the *Chriſtians* of all Ages, if we look upon them as ſilly Men abuſed into a *Religion* by *Fraud* and *Impoſture*; yet we cannot doubt, but that theſe *Perſons* were careful to preſerve the *Records* of that *Religion*, becauſe they were ſo diligent in the ſtudy of it, ſo venturous for it, ſuch enemies to the corrupters of it, ſo induſtrious in propagating the knowledge of it to their *Friends* and *Poſterity*. Do you think our Nation did ever want an *Infallible Teſtimony* to preſerve the *Magna Charta*, ſuppoſing no authentick *Record* of it kept in the *Publick Archives* of the *Nation*? Would not Men's Intereſt make them careful to preſerve it inviolable, eſpecially conſidering the frequency of *Cauſes*, whoſe deciſion depends upon it, and the diſperſion of the *Copies* abroad, and the diligence of ſuch whoſe profeſſion leads them to look to ſuch things. And will not the ſame reaſons hold in a greater meaſure for the *Integrity* and *Incorruption* of *Scriptures*? Do not the eternal Concerns of all *Chriſtians* depend upon thoſe *Sacred Records*, that, if thoſe be not true, *they were of all Men moſt miſerable*? Were not innumerable *Copies* of theſe *Writings* ſuddenly diſperſed abroad, and all *Chriſtians* accounted it a part of their *Religion* to ſearch and enquire into them? Hath there not always been a ſucceſſion of diligent and faithful Perſons, whoſe office and Profeſſion it hath been to read, interpret, and vindicate theſe *Books*? And who have left excellent *Monuments* of their *Endeavours* in this nature? Is it then poſſible to *ſuppoſe* all thoſe *Copies* at once *imbezled*, all thoſe *Chriſtians* in one age *deceived*, all thoſe *Divines* ſo *ſecure* and *negligent* that there ſhould be any conſiderable *alteration*, much leſs any total *depravation* of theſe Writings? When once I ſee a whole *Corporation* conſent to burn their publick *Charter*, and ſubſtitute a *new one* in the place of it, and this not be ſuſpected or diſcovered; When I ſhall ſee a *Magna Charta* foiſted, and neither *King* nor *People* be ſenſible of ſuch a *Cheat*; When all the World ſhall conſpire to *deceive themſelves* and their *Children*, I may then ſuſpect ſuch an *Impoſture* as to the *Scripture*, but not before. And will not all this perſwade you, that there is no neceſſity of making your *Church Infallible* in order to our *Certainty*, that we have the *ſame Books of Scripture* which were delivered by the *Apoſtles*? If not, the next news I ſhall expect to hear from you, will be, That we can have no *certainty* of the *Being of God*, or the *Foundation* of all *Religion*, but from your *Churches Infallibility*; there being every jot as much reaſon to ſay, that all Mankind ſhould be deceived into the belief of a *Deity* by ſome cunning *Politicians*, as that all *Chriſtians* ſhould be deceived as to the *belief* of ſuch *Books* to be *Scripture* which were univerſally corrupted; and if you underſtood *Conſequences*, you would have urged one as ſoon as the other. But ſtill remember, into what *precipices* this good Doctrine of *Infallibility* leads you.

§. 7. But it may be your meaning is more gentle and eaſie, than to ſuppoſe there could be no *certainty* as to all the *Books* being the *ſame*, but only that

that we cannot have any *Infallible Certainty* that there are no *Corruptions* crept into these *Books* which we have, but from your *Churches Testimony.* To which I answer, 1. That there is no reason to suppose this should be your meaning. 2. Supposing it were your meaning, there is no reason in the thing.

1. *There is no reason to suppose this should be your meaning*, for you are speaking of such things which are necessary to be *believed*, and therefore are properly *Objects of Faith*, but that there are no kind of *Corruptions* crept into the *Copies* of *Scripture*, cannot with you be an *Object of Faith.* For those of your Party do *some* of them *confess*, and *others contend*, that there are many *Corruptions* crept into the *Hebrew Text* of the Old *Testament*, and the *Greek* of the *New*; and that there are abundance of Corruptions in your *Vulgar Latin* is not only abundantly proved by our Writers, but acknowledged by the *learnedest* of your own, and irrefragably demonstrated by the different Editions of *Sixtus* and *Clement.*

Suppose this were your meaning, *there were no reason in the thing*; For, 1. *Your Church cannot Infallibly assure us, there are no Corruptions.* 2. *We may be sufficiently assured of it without the Testimony of your Church.*

1. Your *Church* cannot assure us at all, much less *Infallibly*, that there are no such *Corruptions.* For what reason can there be, Why we should rely on the judgment of only a *part* of the whole *Society* of *Christians*, and that *part* at great *opposition* with many other considerable *Churches*; must we then believe your *Church* where it agrees with, or it differs from the rest? If *only where it agrees with the rest*, then it is not the *Testimony* of your *Church* we rely on, but the *universal consent* of all: If *where it differs*, shew us some reason, why we should believe your *Church* in opposition to all others. Especially, 1. When we consider what contradiction there hath been in the Testimony of your *Church* about this very thing: As appears not only by the great difference among your writers concerning the *authentick Copies*, some still defending the *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, and others standing up for that great *Diana of Rome* the *Vulgar Latin.* Considering then, that by the Decree of the *Council of Trent* the *Vulgar Latin* is looked on by you as the most *authentick Copy* of the *Scripture*, let any one judge whether ever this could be judged more authentick, than when the *Pope* himself *in Cathedrâ* doth revise any *Edition* of it, and use all possible care for the setting it forth, not only comparing it with the best ancient *MSS.* but taking the pains to correct it with his own hand, both before and after the *Press*, and all this was done by *Sixtus* 5. as himself declares in the *Preface* to his *Edition* of the *Vulgar Latin*, *A. D.* 1590. Yet within little more than two Years after comes out the Edition of *Clement* 8. which as appears by the computation of such who have taken the pains to compare them, differs from the other in some *thousands* of *places.* Now, I pray tell me, what *Infallible Certainty* are we like to have concerning the *Copies of Scripture*, being the same with those delivered by the *Apostles*, from the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, when this Testimony of your *Church* doth so finely contradict it self within little more than two Years time? Nay, when *Sixtus* 5. his care was so great and extraordinary in his *Edition*, that an *Inscription* was made in the *Vatican*, *in perpetuam rei memoriam*, which is in Letters of *Gold* in these words,

SACRAM PAGINAM EX CONCILII TRIDENTINI PRÆSCRIPTO QUAM EMENDATISSIMAM DIVULGARI MANDAVIT.

Which *Inscription*, as *Angelus Roccha* tells us, was purposely made to set forth that infinite care and pains which the *Pope* took in that edition, *Which were so great* (saith he) *that it is impossible that any should recount them, and for his own part he stood astonished when he saw them:* for he not only carefully corrected the Copy before the Impression, but reviewed it sheet by sheet after, that the *edition* might be the more faithful. And shall we after all this believe that *Sixtus 5. never lived to see this edition compleat*, which is the miserable shift some of your party have to avoid this evident *contradiction:* Or shall we think, what others pretend, *That he never lived to authorize this Edition of his*, whereas his *Brieve* doth in terms declare this to be the *authentick vulgar Latin*, which the Decree of the *Council of Trent* had respect to; but this *Brieve*, others say, *tho' provided was never proclaimed*; It seems then the *Pope's Infalibillity* depends upon *Proclamation*; but was not this *Bull* sufficiently proclaimed which is extant in those editions of *Sixtus 5.?* with an injunction that this Bible be read in all Churches *ne minimâ quidem particulâ, mutatâ, additâ, vel detractâ*, without any the *least alteration.* Now then when the *Vulgar Latin* is owned by the *Council of Trent* for the *authentick Copy* of *Scripture*; when the *Pope* whose testimony must be supposed *Infallible* takes great pains in prosecution of the *decree* of that *Council* to declare and set forth the true authentick *edition* of this *Vulgar Latin*, When should we ever, if not now, expect some *Infallible certainty* of the *true Copy* of the *Scripture?* yet so far are we from it, that not long after Men are forbidden the *use* of that edition under the penalty of the great Excommunication. *And all this*, forsooth, *under the pretence of Typographical faults*, and what then must we think of that *Pope* who took such incessant pains to correct them? Thus we see how far we are from any certainty at all, much more from any Infallible certainty concerning the true *Copies* of *Scripture* from the *authority* of your *Church.* 2. The *authenticalness* of those *Copies* set forth by the appointment of the *Council* of *Trent* and the approbation of the *Pope*, hath no greater evidence of *certainty* than any other *Copies* of *Scripture*, if they have so much. For all that *Sixtus* 5. pretends for the *authenticalness* of that *Copy*, is, the agreement of it with the *ancient* and *approved Copies* both Printed and *MSS.* which he had caused to be diligently searched in Libraries, *Than which*, (saith he) *there can be no more firm or certain argument of the true and genuine text.* Well said however in this! But if the *Latin Copies* be so sure a rule to judge of the *authenticalness* of the *Text* by, shall not much more the *ancient Copies* of the *Original Hebrew* and *Greek*; especially when we consider, that the vast difference of the *Clementine* and *Sixtine Bibles* lay in this, that *Clement* the 8. did correct the *Vulgar Latin* according to the original in above two thousand places, when the contrary reading was established by *Sixtus.* For the *Pope* where he pleased took the *Marginal Annotations* in the *Lovain Bibles* and inserted them into the *text*; which *Marginal Annotations* contain the different *readings* which were observed from the comparing the *Vulgar Latin* with the *Originals*, as appears by the *Preface* to the *Lovain Bibles.* And although the *Pope ex Apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine* (as *Sixtus* 5. phraseth it in the *Bull* before his *Bibles*)

Biblioth. Vatican. p. 229.

In hâc autem germani textûs pervestigatione, satis perspicuè inter omnes constat, nullum argumentum esse certius ac firmius, quam antiquorum probatorumque Codicum Latinorum fidem, quos tam impressos, quam MSS. ex bibliothecis variis conquirendos curavimus. Sixtus 5. Præfat.

Bibles) did take and leave where he pleased himself, yet it is evident from those who have compared them, that above two thousand places are reformed according to the *Originals*; and more than twice as many more might have been if his Holiness had thought good. For our industrious Dr. *James*, who had taken the pains accurately to compare not only the *Sixtine* and *Clementine Bibles*, but the *Clementine* edition with the *Lovain Annotations*, doth in the defence of his *Bellum Papale* challenge *Gretser* the *Jesuite* to joyn *issue* with him if he dared on the point, *viz.* of making it appear that there were 10000 *differences* in the *Lovain Annotations* from the *Vulgar Latin*, and that these differences arise from the comparing it with the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Chaldee*. Are we not then at a fine pass for our *Infallible certainty* concerning the *Copies* of *Scripture*, if the judgment of your *Church* must be rely'd on? Was that sufficient ground for *Pope Clement* to reform two thousand places, and would it not serve for all the *rest?* If those were truer because they *agreed* more with the *Originals*, were not the *rest* so too? And have not we the greatest reason to rely on the *Originals* when the *Pope* himself appeals to them, and reforms by them? According then to the judgment of your pretended *Infallible Church* we have as great *certainty* as they, for certainly the *Hebrew* and *Greek* are as obvious to us as them; and I never yet heard that your *Popes* did challenge to themselves among other *Apostolical prerogatives the gift of tongues.*

P. 49.

2. *We may be sufficiently assured that there are no material corruptions in the Books of Scripture without your Churches testimony.* Not that we pretend the *Apostles Autographa* are still extant for us to compare our *Copies* with (although some of your side tell us among other rarities of the *Vatican*, that the true ancient *Greek* text is their extant, which the *Pope* would do well to oblige the world with) but we whose eyes are not *blest* with such noble *sights* as are there *lock'd* up from all such who have not a good *dose* of implicit Faith about them, pretend to no such thing: but by the diligent comparing the present *Copies* with the most ancient *MSS.* by the observation of what *Citations* of *Scripture* are produced by those of the *Fathers* who lived when some of these *Autographa* were extant (as it is apparent some were in *Tertullian*'s time, and some tell us that the authentick *Apocalypse* was preserved in the *Church* of *Ephesus* in *Honorius* his time) by the diligence of the primitive *writers* in taking notice of the least attempt for falsification or corruption of the text. For when *Marcion* began to clip and falsifie the text, *Irenæus* presently takes notice of it and gives him a sufficient rebuke for it: and so doth *Tertullian* afterwards, and *Epiphanius* particularly takes notice of all those places which had violent hands laid upon them, and rescues them from those impure attempts, so that we still enjoy them in their integrity. So that whatever endeavours were made, they were presently discovered, as that of the *Arrians* by *S. Ambrose*, that of *Tatianus* his *Monotessaron* by *Theodoret*. In so much, that *Bellarmin* himself confesseth; *Etsi multa depravare conati sunt hæretici, tamen nunquam defuerunt Catholici, qui eorum corruptelas dexterint, & non permiserint libros sacros corrumpi.* That the *Catholicks* were as vigilant as the *Hereticks malicious*, and therefore could never effect their design in corrupting the *Scripture*. Besides, it is observable, that among those *multitudes* of *various lections* in the *New Testament*, of which *R. Stephen* made a collection out of sixteen *MSS.* of 2384. (which probably were occasioned by the general dispersion of Copies, and the multitudes of transcriptions by such as were either ignorant or careless) yet there are none which are *material*, so as to entrench upon the integrity and authority of the *Copies* as a rule of *Faith and Manners*; they are therefore but *racings* of the *skin*, but

Bailius contr. Catech. q. 15. tr. 1. Huntl. Controv. 1. c. 13. sect. 9.

Iren. l. 1. c. 28. Tertul. c. Marcion. l. 5. Epiph. hæres. 42.

Ambros. de Sp. S. l. 3. c. 11. Theodoret. de hæret. Fab. l. 1. Bellar. l. 2. de V. D. c. 7.

no

no *wounds* of any vital part. Abating therefore only what muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed in the multitudes of *Copies* tranſcribed, there is ſo great *integrity* and *incorruption* in thoſe *Copies* we have, that we cannot but therein take notice of a peculiar hand of *Divine Providence* in preſerving theſe *authentick records* of our Religion ſo ſafe to our dayes. But it is time now to return to you.

You would therefore perſwade us, *That we have no ground of certainty as to the Copies of Scripture, but comparing them with the Apoſtles Autographa*; but I hope our former diſcourſe hath given you a ſufficient account of our *certainty* without ſeeing the *Apoſtles own hands*. But I pray what certainty then had the *Jews* after the Captivity, of their *Copies* of the *Law?* yet I cannot think you will deny them any ground of certainty in the time of *Chriſt* that they had the true Copies both of the *Law* and the *Prophets*; and I hope you will not make the *Sanhedrin*, which condemned our *Saviour* to death, to have given them their only *Infallible certainty* concerning it. If therefore the *Jews* might be certain without *Infallibility*, why may not we? for if the *Oracles of God* were *committed to the Jews then*, they are to the *Chriſtians* now.

You yet further urge, *That there can be no certainty concerning the Autographa's of the Apoſtles, but by tradition: And may not every univerſal tradition be carried up as clearly at leaſt to the Apoſtles times, as the Scriptures; by moſt credible Authors, who wrote in their reſpective ſucceeding ages?* I anſwer, We grant there can be no certainty as to the *Copies* of *Scripture* but from *tradition*, and if you can name any of thoſe great things in Controverſie between us, which you will undertake to prove to be as *univerſal* a *tradition*, as that of the *Scriptures*; you and I ſhall not differ as to the belief of it. But think not to fob us off with the tradition of the *preſent Church* inſtead of the *Church of all ages*, with the *tradition* of your *Church* inſtead of the *Catholick*, with the ambiguous *teſtimonies* of *two* or *three* of the *Fathers*, inſtead of the *univerſal conſent of the Church ſince the Apoſtles times*. If I ſhould once ſee you prove the *Infallibility of your Church*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Images*, the *neceſſity* of *Cœlibate in the Clergy*, a *punitive Purgatory*, the *lawfulneſs of communicating in one kind*, the *expediency of the Scriptures and Prayers being in an unknown tongue*, the *ſacrifice of the Maſs*, *Tranſubſtantiation* (to name no more) by as *unqueſtionable* and *univerſal a tradition* as that whereby we receive the *Scriptures*, I ſhall extol you for the only perſon that ever did any thing conſiderable on your ſide, and I ſhall willingly yield my ſelf up as a *Trophey* to your brave attempts. Either then for ever forbear to mention any ſuch things, as *Univerſal Tradition among you* as to any things, beſides *Scriptures*, which carry a neceſſity with them of being believed or practiſed; or once for all undertake this task, and manifeſt it as to the things in Controverſie between us. Your next Paragraph (beſides what hath been already diſcuſſed in this Chapter concerning *Apoſtolical tradition* of Scripture) empties it ſelf into the old *mare mortuum* of the *formal object and Infallible application of* Faith, which I cannot think my ſelf ſo much at leaſure to follow you into, ſo often as you fall into it. When once you bring any thing that hath but the leaſt reſemblance of *reaſon* more than before, I ſhall afreſh conſider it, but not till then. What next follows *concerning reſolving Faith into prime Apoſtolical Tradition infallibly, without the Infallibility of the preſent Church*, hath been already prevented by telling you, that his Lordſhip doth not ſay, That the *infallible Reſolution of Faith is into that Apoſtolical Tradition, but into the Doctrine which is conveyed in the books of Scripture*

§. 8. P. 83.

P. 84. *from the Apostles times down to us, by an unquestionable Tradition.* Your stale Objection, *That when we should want Divine Certainty*, hath been over and over answered; and so hath your next Paragraph, *That if the Church be not infallible, we cannot be infallibly certain, that Scripture is God's Word:* and so the remainder concerning *Canonical Books.* It is an easie matter to write great Books after that rate, to swell up your discourses with needless repetitions; but it is the misery that attends a *bad cause*, and a *bad stomach*, to have *unconcocted things* brought up so often, till we *nauseate* them.

§. 9. Your next offer is at the *Vindication* of the noted *place* of S. *Austin*, *I would not believe the Gospel*, &c. *which* (you say) *cannot rationally be understood of Novices, Weaklings, and Doubters in the Faith.* This being then the place at every turn objected by you, and having before reserved the discussion of it to this place, I shall here particularly and throughly consider the meaning of it. In order to which, three things must be enquired into.

1. *What the Controversie was which* S. Austin *was there discussing of?*
2. *What that Church was which* S. *Austin was moved by the Authority of?*
3. *In what way and manner that Churches Authority did perswade him?*

1. Nothing seems more necessary for understanding the meaning of this place, than a true *state* of the *Controversie*, which S. *Austin* was disputing of; and yet nothing less spoke to on either side, than this hath been. We are therefore to consider, that when *Manes* or *Manichæus* began to appear in the world, to broach that strange and absurd Doctrine of his in the *Christian* world, which he had received from *Terebinthus* or *Buddas*, as he from *Scythianus* (who, if we believe *Epiphanius*, went to *Jerusalem* in the *Apostles* times, to enquire into the Doctrine of Christianity, and dispute with the *Christians* about his Opinions) but easily foreseeing what little entertainment so strange a complexion of absurdities would find in the *Christian world*, as long as the writings of the *Apostles* and *Evangelists* were received every where with that esteem and veneration: Two waies he, or his more cunning Disciples, bethought themselves of, whereby to lessen the authority of those writings, and so make way for the Doctrine of *Manichæus.* One was to disparage the *Credulity* of *Christians*, because the *Catholick Church* insisted so much on the necessity of *Faith*, whereas they pretended they would desire Men to believe nothing but what they gave them sufficient reason for. But all this while, since the *Christians* thought they had evident reason for believing the *Scriptures*, and consequently none to believe the Doctrine which did oppose them; therefore they found it necessary to go further, and to charge those *Copies* of *Scripture* with falsifications and corruptions, which were generally received among *Christians.* But these are fully delivered by S. *Austin* in his Book *de utilitate credendi*, as will appear to any one who looks into it; but the latter is that which I aim at; this he therefore taxeth them for, *That with a great deal of impudence, or, to speak mildly, with much weakness, they charged the Scriptures to be corrupted; and yet could not at so small a distance of time prove any corruption by any Copies which were extant. For,* saith he, *if they should say, They would not embrace their writings, because they were written by such who were not careful of writing Truth, their evasion would be more shy, and their errour more pardonable.* But thus, it seems, they did by the *Acts of the Apostles*, utterly denying them to contain matter of Truth in them; and the reason was very obvious for it, because that *Book* gives so clear an account of the sending the *Spirit* upon the *Apostles*, which the *Manichees* pretended

Epiph. hæ. ref. 66.

Nihil mihi videtur ab iis impudentius dici, vel ut mitius loquar, incuriosius & imbecillius, quam Scripturas divinas esse corruptas, cum id nullis, in tam recenti memoriâ, extantibus exemplaribus possint convincere. D. August. de Utilit. cred. c. 3.

pretended was to be only accompliſhed in the Perſon of *Manichæus*. And both before and after, St. *Auſtin* mentions it as their common ſpeech, *That before the time of* Manichæus, *there had been corrupters of the ſacred Books, who had mixed ſeveral things of their own with what was written by the Apoſtles.* And this they laid upon the *Judaizing Chriſtians*, becauſe their great *Pique* was againſt the *Old Teſtament*, and probably ſome further reaſon might be from the *Nazarene Goſpel*; wherein many things were inſerted by ſuch as did *Judaize*. The ſame thing St. *Auſtin* chargeth them with, when he gives an account of their Hereſie. And this likewiſe appears by the management of the diſpute between St. *Auſtin* and *Fauſtus*, who was much the ſubtileſt Man among them. *Fauſtus acknowledged no more to be Goſpel, than what contained the Doctrine delivered by our Saviour, and therefore denied the Genealogies to be any part of the Goſpel*; and afterwards diſputes againſt them, both in St. *Matthew*, and St. *Luke*. And after this St. *Auſtin* notes it *as their uſual cuſtome, when they could not avoid a Teſtimony of Scripture, to deny it.* Thus we ſee what kind of Perſons theſe were, and what their pretences were which St. *Auſtin* diſputes againſt, *They embraced ſo much of Scripture, as pleaſed them, and no more.* To this therefore St. *Auſtin* returns theſe very ſubſtantial Anſwers, *That if ſuch proceedings might be admitted, the Divine Authority of any Books could ſignifie nothing at all for the convincing of Errors. That it was much more reaſonable, either with the Pagans, to deny the whole Bible, or with the* Jews, *to deny the New Teſtament, than thus to acknowledge in general the Books Divine, and to quarrel with ſuch particular paſſages as pinched them moſt; that if there were any ſuſpicion of corruption, they ought to produce more true Copies, and more ancient Books than theirs, or elſe be judged by the Original Languages, with many other things to the ſame purpoſe.* To apply this now to the preſent place in diſpute, St. *Auſtin* in that *Book* againſt the *Epiſtle* of *Manichæus*, begins with the *Preface* to it, which is made in imitation of the *Apoſtles ſtrain*, and begins thus, *Manichæus Apoſtolus Jeſu Chriſti, providentiâ Dei Patris, &c.* To this St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *he believes no ſuch thing, as that* Manichæus *was an Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, and hopes they will not be angry with him for it; for he had learned of them not to believe without reaſon.* And therefore deſires them to prove it: *It may be* (ſaith he) *one of you may read me the Goſpel, and thence perſwade me to believe it. But, what if you ſhould meet with one, who, when you read the Goſpel, ſhould ſay to you, I do not believe it? But, I ſhould not believe the Goſpel, if the Authority of the Church did not move me: Whom therefore I obey in ſaying, Believe the Goſpel, ſhould I not obey in ſaying, Believe not* Manichæus? The *Queſtion*, we ſee, is concerning the proving the *Apoſtleſhip of Manichæus*, which cannot in it ſelf be proved, but from ſome *Records*, which muſt ſpecifie ſuch an *Apoſtleſhip* of his; and to any one who ſhould queſtion the *Authenticalneſs* of thoſe *Records*, it can only be proved by the Teſtimony and Conſent of the *Catholick Church*, without which St. *Auſtin* profeſſeth, he ſhould never have believed the *Goſpel*, i. e. *that theſe were the only true and undoubted Records, which are left us of the Doctrine and Actions*

Quam multa ſoleant dicere immixta eſſe ſcripturis divinis, à neſcio quibus corruptoribus veritatis.
Volunt enim neſcio quos corruptores divinorum librorum ante ipſius Manichæi tempora fuiſſe. Id. ib.
Corrupiſſe autem illos, qui Judæorum legem Evangelio miſcere cupiebant.

Ipſiuſq; Novi Teſtamenti Scripturas tanquam infalſatas ita legunt, ut quod voluerint inde accipiant, quod nolunt rejiciant. Aug. hæreſ. 46.
Evangelium quidem à prædicatione Chriſti & eſſe cœpit & nominari: at verò Genealogia adeo non eſt Evangelium, ut nec ipſe ejus ſcriptor auſus fuerit eam Evangelium nominare. Fauſtus apud Auguſt. c. Fauſtum. l. 2. init. l. 3. init. l. 5. init.
Ubi ſic manifeſtâ veritate iſti præfocantur ut obſeſſi de lucidis verbis Sanctarum Scripturarum, exitum in iis fallaciæ ſuæ reperire non poſſint; id teſtimonium, quod prolatum eſt, falſum eſſe reſpondent. c. Fauſtum. l. 11. c. 2.

Quæ autoritas literarum aperiri, quis facer liber evolvi, quod documentum cujuſlibet Scripturæ ad convincendos errores exeri poteſt, ſi hæc vox admittitur, ſi alicujus poſſeris æſtimatur? Id. ib.

Si ergo invenires aliquem, qui Evangelio nondum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, Non credo? Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Catholicæ eccleſiæ commoveret auctoritas. Quibus ergo obtemperavi dicentibus, Credite Evangelio, cur eis non obtemperem dicentibus mihi, Noli credere Manichæo? c. Ep. Fundam. c. 5.

of Christ. And he had very good reason to say so; for otherwise the *Authority of those Books* should be questioned every time any one, such as *Manichæus*, should pretend himself an *Apostle:* Which Controversies there can be no other way of deciding, but by the *Testimony* of the *Church*, which hath received and embraced these *Copies* from the time of their first publishing. And that this was St. *Austin*'s meaning, will appear by several parallel places in his *Disputes* against the *Manichees.* For in the same Chapter, speaking concerning the *Acts of the Apostles*, *Which Book* (saith he) *I must believe, as well as the Gospel, because the same Catholick Authority commends both: i. e.* The same *Testimony* of the *Universal Church*, which delivers the *Gospel* as the *authentick writings of the Evangelists*, doth likewise deliver the *Acts of the Apostles for an authentick writing of one of the same Evangelists:* So that there can be no reason to believe the one, and not the other. So when he disputes against *Faustus*, who denied the truth of some things in St. *Paul*'s Epistles; he bids him shew a *truer Copy* than that the *Catholick Church* received, which *Copy*, if he should produce, he desires to know how he would prove it to be *truer* to one that should deny it. *What would you do?* (saith he) *Whither would you turn your self? What Original of your Book could you shew? What Antiquity, what Testimony of a succession of Persons from the time of the writing of it?* But on the contrary, *What huge advantage the Catholicks have, who, by a constant Succession of Bishops in the Apostolical Sees, and by the consent of so many People, have the Authority of the Church confirmed to them for the clearing the validity of its Testimony concerning the Records of Scripture.* And after lays down Rules for the *trying of Copies*, where there appears any difference between them, viz. *by comparing them with the Copies of other Countries, from whence the Doctrine originally came; and if those Copies vary too, the more Copies should be preferred before the fewer, the ancienter before the latter: If yet any uncertainty remains, the original Language must be consulted.* This is, in case a Question ariseth among the acknowledged authentical *Copies* of the *Catholick Church* (in which case we see, he never sends Men to the *Infallible Testimony of the Church*, for certainty as to the *Truth* of the *Copies*) but if the Question be, Whether any *writing* it self be *authentical* or no, then it stands to the greatest reason, that the Testimony of the *Catholick Church* should be relied on, which, by reason of its *large spread*, and continual *Succession* from the very time of those *writings*, cannot but give the most indubitable Testimony concerning the *Authenticalness* of the *Writings* of the *Apostles* and *Evangelists.* And were it not for this Testimony, St. *Austin* might justly say, *He should not believe the Gospel, i. e.* Suppose those writings which contain the *Gospel* in them (for it is plain he speaks of *them*, and not the *Doctrine* abstractly considered) should have wanted that *consent* of the *Catholick Church*, that it had not been delivered down by a constant succession of all Ages from the *Apostles*, and were not received among the *Christian Churches*, but started out from a few Persons who differ from all *Christian Churches*, as this *Apostleship* of *Manichæus* did; he might justly question the *Truth* of them. And this I take to be the truest and most natural account of these so much controverted words of St. *Austin*; by which sense the other two Questions are easily answered: For it is plain, St. *Austin* means

Cui libro necesse est me credere, si credo Evangelio; quoniam utramq; Scripturam similiter mihi Catholica commendat authoritas. ib.

Quid ages? quò te convertes? quam libri à te prolati originem, quam vetustatem, quam seriem successionis testem citabis? Aug. c. Faustum, l. 11. c. 2.

Et vides in hâc re quid Ecclesiæ Catholicæ valeat authoritas, quæ ab ipsis fundatissimis sedibus Apostolorum usq; ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibimet Episcoporum serie, & tot populorum consensione firmatur. Id. ib.

Ita si de fide exemplarium quæstio verteretur sicut in nonnullis, quæ & pauca sunt & Sacrarum Literarum studiosis notissimæ sententiarum varietates, vel ex aliarum Regionum codicibus, unde ipsa Doctrina commeavit, nostra dubitatio dijudicaretur: vel, si tibi quoque codices variarent, plures paucioribus, aut vetustiores recentioribus præferrentur: & si adhuc incerta varietas, præcedens lingua unde illud interpretatum est consuleretur. Id. ib.

means not the *judgment of the present Church*, but of the *Catholick Church*, in the most comprehensive sense, as taking in all *Ages and Places*, or in *Vincentius* his words, *Succession*, *Universality*, and *Consent*; and it further appears, that the influence which this Authority hath, is sufficient to induce Assent to the thing attested in all Persons who consider it, in what Age, Capacity, or Condition soever. And therefore, if in this sense you extend it beyond *Novices and Weaklings*, I shall not oppose you in it; but it cannot be denied, that it is intended chiefly for *doubters in the Faith*, because the design of it is to give Men satisfaction as to the *reason* why they ought to *believe*. But neither you, nor any of those you call *Catholick Authors*, will ever be able to prove, that St. *Austin* by these words ever dreamt of any *Infallible Authority in the present Church*, as might be abundantly proved from the Chapter foregoing, where he gives an account of his being in the *Catholick Church*, from the *Consent of People and Nations*, *from that Authority which was begun by Miracles*, *nourished by Hope*, *increased by Charity*, *confirmed by continuance*, which certainly are not the expressions of one who resolved his Faith into the *Infallible Testimony* of the *present Church*. And the whole scope and design of this Book *de utilitate credendi*, doth evidently refute any such apprehension, as might be easily manifested, were it not too large a subject for this place, where we only examine the meaning of St. *Austin* in another Book. The substance of which is, that that Speech of his doth not contain a *Resolution of his Faith*, as to the *Divinity of Christ's Doctrine*; but the *resolution* of it, as to the *Truth* and *Authenticalness* of the *Writings* of the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, which we acknowledge to be into the Testimony of the *Catholick Church*, in the most large and comprehensive sense.

The next thing we come to consider, is, an Absurdity you charge on his Lordship, viz. *That if the Infallible Authority of the Church be not admitted in the Resolution, he must have recourse to the private Spirit, which* (say you) *though he would seem to exclude from the state of the Question, yet he falls into it under the specious Title of Grace; so that he only changeth the words, but admits the same thing*, for which you cite, p. 83, 84. *That therein his Lordship should aver, that where others used to say, They were infallibly resolved that Scripture was God's Word, by the Testimony of the Spirit within them, that he hath the same assurance of Grace.* Whether you be not herein guilty of abusing his Lordship by a plain perverting of his meaning, will be best seen by producing his words. *A Man* (saith he) *is probably led by the Authority of the present Church, as by the first informing, inducing, perswading means, to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God: But, when he hath studied, considered, and compared this Word with it self, and with other Writings, with the help of ordinary Grace, and a mind morally induced, and reasonably perswaded by the Voice of the Church, the Scripture then gives greater and higher Reasons of Credibility to it self, than Tradition alone could give. And then he that believes, resolves his last and full assent, that Scripture is of Divine Authority, into internal Arguments found in the Letter it self, though found by the help and direction of Tradition without, and Grace within.* Had you not a great mind to calumniate, who could pick out of these words, *That the Bishop resolved his Faith into Grace?* Can any thing be more plain, than the contrary is from them, when in the most perspicuous terms he says, *that the last Resolution of Faith is internal Arguments, and only supposeth Tradition and Grace as necessary helps for the finding them?* Might you not then as well have said, That his Lordship, notwithstanding his Zeal against the *Infallibility of Tradition*, is fain to resolve his *Faith* into it at last, as well as say, that he doth it *into Grace*; for

§. 19. P. 85. n. 3.

P. 83.

for he joyns these two together? But, it is not possible to assert the *Use* and *Necessity* of *Grace*, in order to *Faith*, but the last Resolution of it must be into it? Do not all your *Divines*, as well as ours, *suppose* and *prove* the *Necessity of Grace*, in order to *believing*; and, Are they not equally guilty of having recourse to the *private Spirit?* Do you really think your self, that there is any thing of *Divine Grace in Faith* or no? If there be, free your Self then from the *private Spirit*, and you do his Lordship. For shame then forbear such pitiful Calumnies; which, if they have any truth in them, You are as much concerned as Your Adversary in it. You would next perswade us, *That the Relator never comes near the main difficulty, which* (say you) *is, if the Church be supposed fallible in the Tradition of Scripture, how it shall be certainly known, whether* de facto, *she now errs not in her delivery of it?* If this be your grand Difficulty, it is sufficiently assoiled already, having largely answered this Question *in terminis*, in the preceding Chapter.

You ask further, *What they are to do who are unresolved which is the true Church*; as though it were necessary for Men to know which is the *true Church*, before they can believe the *Scriptures to be the Word of God?* But when we assert the *Tradition of the Church* to be *necessary* for believing the *Scriptures*, we do not thereby understand the particular *Tradition* of any particular *Church* whose judgment they must rely on, but the *Universal Tradition* of all *Christians*, though this must be first made known in some particular Society, by the means of some *particular Persons*, though their *Authority* doth not oblige us to believe, but only are the means whereby Men come acquainted with that *Universal Tradition*. And therefore your following Discourse *concerning the knowing the true Church by its Motives is superseded*; for we mean no other *Church* than the *Community of Christians* in this Controversie; and, if you ask me, *By what Motives I come to be certain which is a Community of Christians, and which of Mahometans, and how one should be known from another*, I can soon resolve you: But we are so far from making it necessary to know *which particular Society of Christians* in opposition to others, is the *true Church* for resolving this Question, that we look on it as a great argument of the *Credibility* as well as *Universality* of this *Tradition*, that all these differing *Societies* consent in it. And not only they, but the greatest opposers of *Christianity*, *Jews*, or *Philosophers*, could never see any reason to call in question such a *Tradition*.

His Lordship the better to represent *the use of Tradition* in the last resolution of Faith makes *use of this Illustration*, *That as the knowledge of Grammar and Logick is necessary in order to the making a Demonstration, yet the knowledge of the Conclusion is not resolved into Grammar or Logick, but into the immediate Principles out of which it is deduced: So a Man's first Preparative to Faith is the Churches Tradition, but his full and last assent is resolved into the internal Arguments of Scripture.* This you quarrel with,
P. 86. and tell us, *There is not the same Analogy between Logick and Church-Tradition*; your meaning, I suppose is, because *Logick* doth *Physically* by inlarging the Understanding fit Men for *Demonstrations*, but *Church-Tradition* cannot enable Men to understand the *Scripture*. But cannot you easily discern that *Analogy* which his Lordship brought this Illustration for, which is, that some things may be necessary *Preparations* for Knowledge, which that *Knowledge* is not resolved into. Is not this plain in *Logick*, and is it not as plain between *Tradition* and *Scripture?* For though *Tradition* doth not open our *Eyes* to see this Light, yet it presents the Object to us to be seen, and that in an unquestionable manner. *But for all this*, say you, *a Man must either receive it on the sole Authority of Church-Tradition, or*

he

be as much in the dark as ever, Why ſo? Is there any repugnancy in the thing, that Scripture ſhould be received firſt upon the account of Tradition, and yet afterwards Men reſolve their Faith into the *Scripture* it ſelf? May not a Man very probably believe that a *Diamond* is ſent him from a Friend upon the teſtimony of the *Meſſenger* who brings it, and yet be firmly perſwaded of it, by diſcerning the *Sparklings* of it? *But*, ſay you further, *The Scriptures themſelves appear no more to be the Word of God, than the Stars to be of a certain determinate number, or the diſtinction of colours to a blind Man.* If this approach not to the higheſt blaſphemy againſt the *Scripture*, I know not what doth. He that ſhall compare this ſaying of yours, with that in the precedent Chapter, *That if Chriſt had not left the Church Infallible, he might be accounted an Impoſtor and Deceiver*, may eaſily gueſs how much of *Religion* you believe in your heart, when on ſo ſmall occaſions you do ſo openly diſparage both *Chriſt* and the *Scriptures*. It is well yet, your *Churches* Infallibility can ſtand on no better terms than theſe are; which will be ſufficient to keep any who have any true ſenſe of the *truth* and *excellency* of *Chriſt* and the *Scriptures* from hearkening to it. But are you in good earneſt when you ſay, that *Scriptures themſelves appear no more to be the Word of God, than the diſtinction of colours to a blind Man*, which is as much as nothing at all? Is there *nothing* at all in the *excellency* of the *Doctrine* and *Precepts* contained in the *Scriptures*, *nothing* in thoſe clear *diſcoveries* of *God* and our *ſelves*, *nothing* in all thoſe *tranſactions* between *God* and Men, *nothing* in that *Covenant* of Redemption between *God* and *Man* through *Chriſt*, *nothing* in the clear *accompliſhment* and *fulfilling* of *Propheſies*, *nothing* in that admirable *ſtrain* and *ſtyle* which is in the writings, *nothing* in that harmonious *conſent* which is diſcovered in writers of ſeveral ages, intereſts, places, and conditions, *nothing* in that *admirable efficacy* which the *Doctrine* of it hath upon the ſouls of Men to perſwade them to renounce ſin, the world, and themſelves for the ſake of it; is there *nothing* more (I ſay) in all theſe, which makes the *Scripture* appear to be the *Word of God*, *than the diſtinction of colours to a blind Man?* Could you aſſoon think *to account the ſtars* as diſcern any thing of *Divinity* from theſe things in the *Scriptures?* If your *eyes* were as *blind* as your *underſtanding*, could you aſſoon diſtinguiſh *white* from *black*, as the *Scripture* from the *Alcoran*, if they were both preſented to you to read, and judge of them according to the evidence you found in them? Is it poſſible a Man that owns himſelf a *Chriſtian*, ſhould utter ſuch opprobrious language of the *Scripture?* You had been before ſpeaking *what honour you give to the Scripture*, notwithſtanding you pretend your *Church Infallible*, and I had mentioned ſome of thoſe paſſages which occur in your writers in diſparagement of them: but I muſt needs ſay they all fall ſhort of this; the *Noſe of Wax*, the *Inky Divinity*, the *Lesbian rule*, are *Courtlike expreſſions* to this of yours; for this puts no difference in the world between the *Scripture* and the *Alcoran*, if your *Church* ſhould propound the one as well as the other. For you could not poſſibly ſay worſe of the *Alcoran*, than *that of it ſelf it appears no more to be the Word of God, than diſtinction of colours to a blind Man.* I might here ſend you to be chaſtiſed for this inſolent *Atheiſtical* expreſſion to the Primitive *Fathers*, who ſpeak ſo much in admiration of the *excellency* of *Scriptures*, who did vindicate them from all aſſaults of the *Heathen Philoſophers*. I might ſend you to thoſe of your own party, who if they have any love or tenderneſs for *Chriſtian Religion* will not ſuffer ſuch paſſages to paſs without the moſt ſevere rebukes: I might ſufficiently prove the contrary from the arguments uſed againſt *Atheiſts* by *Bellarmine* and others; but I ſhall

content

content my ſelf with that noble and Chriſtian confeſſion of your *Gregory de Valentiâ*, from whom you might learn more piety and modeſty towards the Sacred *Scriptures*. *There being many things in the Doctrine of Chriſtianity it ſelf, which of themſelves may conciliate belief and authority, yet that ſeems the greateſt to me (as hath been obſerved by Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius and others) that I know not with what admirable force, but moſt divine, it affects the hearts of Men, and ſtirs them up to vertue. It is written with great ſimplicity, and without almoſt any artifice or ornament of ſpeech; which is an argument that its authority is not humane but Divine, for no humane writing hath any power on the minds of Men without a great deal of art and eloquence* How many things are there in this ingenuous and pious confeſſion of this learned *Jeſuite*, which might, if you have any ſhame left, make you ſenſible of the Blaſphemy of your former expreſſion? For, 1. He ſaith, there are many things in the *doctrine* of *Chriſtianity* which *for themſelves* may conciliate our belief, and manifeſt their authority: If *for themſelves* then certainly the *Scriptures of themſelves* have a great deal more evidence, that they are *the Word of God, than the diſtinction of colours to a blind Man.* 2. That the peculiar *ſtrain* and *genius* of *Scripture* argues ſomething *Divine* in it, becauſe, notwithſtanding its ſimplicity it hath ſo great power and efficacy on the minds of Men; far beyond any humane art or *Rhetorick*. 3. That this may be diſcerned in the very *Books* of *Scripture* without the ſuppoſition of the authority of any *Church*; for he mentions the Doctrine meerly as written, and what may be found by the reading of it. Go then, and learn ſome piety and ingenuity (where it is ſo ſeldome to be learned) from a *Jeſuite*, and think not that we ſhall ever have the meaner thoughts of the *Scripture* for ſuch bold expreſſions; but, we can eaſily ſee, that the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and the *Honour* of *Scripture* cannot poſſibly ſtand together.

Cum multa ſint in ipſâ Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ quæ ipſa per ſe fidem illi & autoritatem conciliare poſſint, tamen mihi maximum illud eſſe videtur, (ut à Clement. Alex. & à Lactant, & ab aliis eſt obſervatum) quod ſuâ neſcio qua admirabili vi, divinè prorſus hominum animos afficit, atque ad vertutem impellit. Eſt ſcripta verbis ſimplicibus, & caret fe è artificio orationis & ornamentis; nihilominus ita vehementer lectoris mentem commovet, ut nulla alia doctrina. Quod argumento eſt, illius autoritatem omnino Divinam eſſe, & non humanam; hæc enim ſine verborum arte, & orationis quaſi lenociniis, ad efficiendum animorum motum non valet. Greg. de. Valentiâ, Analyſ. fidei. l. 1. c. 25.

Your ſubſequent diſcourſe conſiſts of ſome rare pieces of ſubtilty, which may be reſolved into theſe conſequences: If your *Church of* Rome *hath erred as to the number of Canonical Books*, then *the Catholick Church, ever ſince Chriſt's time, hath erred*; if *the Church may erre, then we cannot be certain but ſhe hath erred*; if *we can have no infallible certainty, then we can have none at all*; Theſe conſequences your diſcourſe to n. 5. may be reſolved into; and make good ever a one of them, I will ſay you have proved ſomething; which is more than you have done yet.

§. 11. P. 87. N. 5. You object againſt his Lordſhip, *That he requires ſo many things in order to the reſolution of Faith, that he makes none capable of it, but Men of extraordinary parts and learning.* To which I anſwer, that his Lordſhip is not undertaking to give an account of the *Faith* of *rude or illiterate perſons*, but ſuch a one as may ſatisfie Men of parts and learning, *i. e.* he endeavoured to lay down the *true rational account* of it, and not to enquire how far *God* obligeth every Man that comes to Heaven, to a *critical Reſolution* of his *Faith*. And therefore for the generality of ſuch perſons who heartily believe the *Truth of Scriptures*, but are not able to give a clear and ſatisfactory account of it to others; I anſwer, as S. *Auſtin* did in the ſame caſe, *Cæteram quippe turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, ſed credendi ſimplicitas tutiſſimam facit*: That *God* requires not from the common ſort of

Aug. c. ep. Fund. c. 4.

of believers, the *ſubtilty of Speculation, but the ſimplicity of Faith*; which may be very firm even in them from the reading of *Scriptures*, and hearing the *Doctrine* of it plainly delivered to them, though they are not able to give ſuch accounts of their Faith, which may be ſatisfactory to any but themſelves. So we ſay, *That the way is ſo plain, that mean capacities may not err therein.* But, I wonder at you, of all Men, that you ſhould charge our way with *Intricacy*, who lead Men into ſuch perplexities and difficulties, before they can be ſatisfied that they ought to believe; for to this end you make the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church* neceſſary; and, how many inſuperable difficulties are there before one can be aſſured of that? Firſt, he muſt know your *Church* to be the *True Church*, and this muſt be proved by a continual *ſucceſſion* of *Paſtors* in your *Church*, and by a *conformity* of your *Doctrine* with the *Ancients*; and, Do you think theſe two are not very eaſie Introductions to *Faith*, like the taking *Rome* in ones way, to go from *York* to *London*; but, though a Man ſhould pull down a *Houſe* to find a *Key* to open it, and after he had ſearched in all the rubbiſh of *Antiquity*, find enough to perſwade him *yours* may be a *True Church*, yet he is as far from believing as ever, unleſs he finds a way through another *Trap-door* for his *Faith*, which is, that *yours*, though a particular *Church*, is yet the only *Catholick Church*, *i. e.* that the firſt *room* he comes in, is *infallibly* the *whole Houſe*, and therefore he never needs look further. But, ſuppoſing this, yet if he doth not believe this *Church* to be *Infallible* in *all* it ſays, he had as good never come into it; and therefore he muſt believe ſtrenuouſly, *That whatever it ſays, is infallibly true*, which being ſo hard a task, (as for a Man that ſees a Houſe *half down* before his eyes, to believe it can never *fall*) it had need have ſome good *Buttreſſes* to ſupport it, and at laſt finds nothing but ſome feeble *Motives of Credibility*, which ſignifie nothing as to the *Church*, but might have been ſtrong enough, if ſet in the right place, *viz.* not to ſupport the *Church*, but to prove the truth of Chriſtian Doctrine. Theſe, and many other *Intrigues*, which I have formerly diſcovered, do unavoidably attend the reſolution of your *Faith*, among all Perſons who profeſs to believe on the account of your *Churches Infallibility*.

What follows next concerning *Grace*, is already anſwered: What certainty we have that *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation*, and conſequently what obligation lies upon Men to believe it, are things largely diſcourſed on in the beginning of this Chapter; and I ſhall ſuppoſe ſufficiently cleared, till you ſhew me reaſon to the contrary: By which it will appear (contrary to what follows n. 6.) that we have the *higheſt Reaſons* or *Motives of Credibility*, to aſſent to the *Truth*, and *Divine Authority of the Scriptures*.

But you proceed to an attempt of ſomething new; which is, in a long harangue to diſprove his Lordſhip's Opinion of *reſolving Faith* into that *Divine Light* which appears in *Scripture*. This you inſiſt on from n. 6. to n. 8. the ſubſtance of all which diſcourſe, I ſuppoſe, may be reduced to theſe three things. 1. *That though the Scripture be called a Light, yet that is to be underſtood only of thoſe who own its authority.* 2. *That the Scripture cannot ſhew it ſelf to be an Infallible Light.* 3. *That if there were ſuch Light in Scripture, all others would ſee it as well as he.* Before I come to a particular handling of each of theſe, it will be neceſſary to conſider, What it is which his Lordſhip means by this *Divine Light* in *Scripture*; for, there is nothing cauſeth more confuſion in the diſcourſes and apprehenſions of Men, than the applying *Metaphors* taken from the *ſenſe* to the *acts* of the *Underſtan-* §. 12.

ding: For, by this means, we are apt to judge of our intellectual acts in a way wholly suitable to those of *sense*. We are not therefore to conceive, there can be any thing in *Divine Truths*, which so immediately doth discover it self to the mind, as *light* doth to the *eye*. But that only which bears proportion to the *light* in the Mind, is *reason*; for Men's Minds being *discursive*, and not *intuitive*, they do not behold the truth of things by immediate *intuition*, but by such *reason* and *arguments* as do induce and perswade to assent. We are not therefore to imagine any such *Light* in Scripture, that doth as immediately work upon the Understanding, as the *Light* of the *Sun* doth on the Organs of Sight; and therefore that common speech, that *Light doth discover it self as well as other things*, is in this sense improperly applied to the Understanding; for, whatever is discovered to the mind in a *discursive manner*, as all Objects of Faith are, must have some antecedent *evidence* to it self, which must be the ground of the act of Assent. That therefore which is called the *Divine Light of Scripture*, is, I suppose that *rational evidence* which is contained in the *Books* of *Scripture*, whereby any reasonable Man may be perswaded that these *Books* are of *Divine Authority*. Now that herein I say nothing beyond or besides his Lordship's meaning and intention, will appear by his own discourse on this subject. For, 1. His Lordship designedly disproves that Opinion that

P. 69. Sect. 16. n. 10. *Scripture should be fully and sufficiently known as by Divine and Infallible Testimony*, lumine proprio, *by the resplendency of that Light which it hath in it self only, and by the witness that it can so give to it self. Because, as there is no place in Scripture that tells us such Books containing such and such particulars, are the Canon and Infallible Will of God; so, if there were any such place, that could be no sufficient proof*; for, *a Man may justly ask another Book to bear witness to that, and so* in infinitum. *Again, this inbred Light of Scripture is a thing coincident with Scripture it self, and so the Principles and the Conclusion in this kind of proof should be entirely the same, which cannot be. Besides, if this inward Light were so clear, how could there have been any variety among the ancient Believers, touching the authority of S.* James, *and S.* Judes *Epistles, and the Apocalypse*, &c. *For certainly the Light which is in the Scripture, was the same then which now it is.* On these reasons then, we see, his Lordship not only disclaims, but disproves such knowing the Scripture meerly by the Light within. Two things then I hence infer, which will be very necessary to clear his Lordship's meaning. 1. That he no where attributes such an *inward Light* to *Scripture*, that *by it self* it can discover that these *Books* are from *God*. 2. That where his Lordship mentions this *Light* most, he supposeth *Tradition* antecedent to it, as appears by his whole Discourse. From whence I gather this to have been the plainest account of his way of resolving Faith, as I have already intimated, *viz.* that the *resolution of Faith* may be considered two ways; into the *Books*, and into the *Doctrine* contained in them. The *resolution* into the *Books*, must, of necessity, suppose *Tradition*, and rely upon it; and this kind of *Resolution* of *Faith*, cannot be into any *Self-evidence*, or *Internal Light:* But, supposing the *Books* owned on the account of *Tradition*, if the Question be concerning the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, then he asserts, that the *Resolution* of this is into the *Divine Light* of Scripture, *i. e.* into that *rational evidence* which we find of the Divinity of it, in these Books which are owned on the account of Tradition.

P. 101. n. 32. And that this is his Lordship's meaning, appears, 2. By his own Testimony, who was best able to explain himself; for, when he goes about to confirm his Opinion by the Testimonies of the Fathers, he tells us, *This*

was

was the way which the ancient Church ever uſed, namely, Tradition, or Eccleſiaſtical Authority firſt, and then all other arguments, but eſpecially internal, from the Scripture it ſelf. And, for this firſt, inſtanceth in St. *Auguſtine, who* (ſaith he) *gives four proofs all internal to the Scripture it ſelf, which are, Firſt, The Miracles. Secondly, That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine. Thirdly, Fulfilling of Prophecies. Fourthly, The Efficacy of it for Converſion of the World.* All theſe we ſee he inſtanceth in, as internal arguments, and therefore make up that which he calls *Divine Light.* So that all that he means by this *Light of Scripture,* is only that *rational evidence* of the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine,* which may be diſcovered in it, or deduced from it.

Having thus explained his Lordſhip's meaning, it will be no matter of difficulty to return an Anſwer to the Particulars by you alledged.

1. You ſay, *That when Scripture is ſaid to be a Light by the Royal Prophet, it is to be underſtood in this ſenſe, Becauſe, after we have once received it from the Infallible Authority of the Church, it teacheth what we are to do and believe.* But, 1. Doth not the *Scripture* ſufficiently teach what we are to do and believe, ſuppoſing it not received on the infallible Authority of the Church? Doth that add any thing to the *Light of the Scripture?* Or, do you ſuppoſe the neceſſity of infallibly believing it on the *Churches Authority,* before one can diſcern what it teacheth us to do and believe?

2. What ground have you, in the leaſt, to imagine, that *David* ever believed the *Scripture* on the *Infallible Authority* of the *Church:* That he doth ſuppoſe it to be *God's Word,* when he ſaith, It is a *light to his feet,* I deny not; but that he ſhould ſuppoſe it to be ſo, becauſe the *Church* did infallibly tell him it was ſo, is a moſt ungrounded Aſſertion. Had he not ſufficient evidence that the *Law* was from *God,* by thoſe many unqueſtionable and ſtupendious *Miracles,* which attended the delivery of it? Was not the whole Conſtitution and Government of the *Jewiſh Nation,* an impregnable argument that thoſe things were true, which were recorded in their Books? Did ever the *Jewiſh Sanhedrin, High Prieſt,* or others, arrogate to themſelves any infallible Teſtimony, in delivering the Books of *Moſes* to the People? The moſt you can ſuppoſe of a ground of certainty among them, was from that *Sacred Record* of the *Book* of the *Law,* which was kept in the *Ark:* And how could they know that was *Authentick,* but from the ſame *Tradition,* which conveyed the *Miracles* of *Moſes* to them? So that nothing like any infallible Authority of a *Church* was looked on by them as neceſſary to believe the Law to have been from God. 3. Suppoſing it from Tradition unqueſtionable, that the *Law* was from *God,* thoſe incomparable directions which were in it might be a great confirmation to *David's Faith,* that it was his Word. Which is that he intends, in theſe words, *Thy Word is a light to my feet,* &c. to ſhew that excellency and perſpicuity which was in his *Word,* that it gave him the beſt directions for ordering his Converſation. And this is all which his Lordſhip means, that to thoſe, who, by the advantage of Tradition, have already venerable thoughts of *Scripture;* the ſerious converſing with it, doth highly advance them, and eſtabliſh their belief of it, as *that Faith* is thereby *clinched* which was *driven in* by education. And therefore, when he ſaith, *That Light diſcovers its ſelf as well as other things,* he preſently adds, *not till there hath been a preparing inſtruction what Light it is. Thus,* (he ſaith) *the Tradition of the Church is the firſt moral motive to belief: But the belief it ſelf; that Scripture is the Word of God, reſts upon Scripture, when a Man finds it to anſwer and exceed that which the Church gave in Teſtimony.* P. 84. For this his Lordſhip cites *Origen,* who, though much nearer the prime

Tradition than we are, yet being to prove that the Scriptures were inſpired from God, he ſaith, *De hoc aſſignabimus ex ipſis Scripturis Divinis, quæ nos competenter moverint*, &c. *We will mention thoſe things out of the Sacred Scriptures, which have perſwaded us*, &c. To this you anſwer, *Though* Origen *prove by the Scriptures themſelves, that they were inſpired from God; yet doth he never avow, that this could be proved out of them, unleſs they were received by the Infallible Authority of the Church.* Which Anſwer is very unreaſonable. For, 1. It might be juſtly expected that when his *Lordſhip* had produced an expreſs Teſtimony to his purpoſe out of *Origen*, you ſhould have brought ſome other as clear for his believing *Scripture* on the *Churches Infallibility*, which you are ſo far from, that you would put us to prove a *Negative*: But, if you will deal fairly, and as you ought to do, produce your Teſtimonies out of him, and the reſt of the Fathers concerning your Churches Infallibility. Till then, excuſe us if we take their expreſs words, and leave you to gather *Infallibility* out of their latent meanings. 2. What doth your Infallibility conduce to believing *Scriptures* for *themſelves?* For, you ſay, *The Scriptures cannot be proved by themſelves to be God's Word, unleſs they were received by the Infallible Authority of the Church*; it ſeems then, if they be ſo received, they may be proved by themſelves to be *God's Word.* Are thoſe Proofs by *themſelves* ſufficient for *Faith*, or no? If not, they are very ſlender Proofs: If they be, what need your *Churches Infallibility?* Unleſs you will ſuppoſe, no Man can diſcern thoſe Proofs without your *Churches Teſtimony*; and then they are not *Proofs* by *themſelves*, but from your Churches Infallibility; which may ſerve for one acceſſion more to the *heap* of your *Contradictions.* His Lordſhip aſſerting the *laſt Reſolution of Faith* to be into ſimply Divine Authority, cites that ſpeech of *Henr. à Gandavo, That in the Primitive Church, when the Apoſtles themſelves ſpake, they did believe principally for the ſake of God, and not the Apoſtles*; from whence he infers, *If, where the Apoſtles themſelves ſpake, the laſt reſolution of Faith was into God, and not into themſelves on their own account; much more ſhall it now be into God, and not the preſent Church, and into the Writings of the Apoſtles, than into the words of their Succeſſors made up into Tradition.* All that you anſwer, is, *That this Argument muſt be ſolved by the Biſhop, as well as you, becauſe he hath granted the Authority of the Apoſtles was Divine as well as you.* Was there ever a more ſenſeleſs Anſwer! Doth *Gandavo* deny the *Apoſtles Authority* to have been *Divine?* Nay, Doth he not imply it, when he ſaith, Men did not believe for the *Apoſtles ſake*, but for *God's*, who ſpake by them. As St. *Paul* ſaid, *You received our Word, not as the Word of Men, but as it is indeed the Word of God.* How *the Biſhop ſhould be concerned to anſwer this*, is beyond my ſkill to imagine. If *Origen ſpeaks to ſuch as believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God*; ſo doth the *Biſhop* too, *viz.* on the account of Tradition and Education. If *Origen* endeavoured by thoſe Proofs to confirm and ſettle their Faith, that is all the *Biſhop* aims at, that a Faith taken up on the Churches Tradition, may be ſettled and confirmed by the internal Arguments of Scripture. But, how you ſhould from this Diſcourſe aſſert, *That the Authority of the Church muſt be Infallible in delivering the Scripture*, is again beyond my reach, neither can I poſſibly think what ſhould bear the face of *Premiſes* to ſuch a *Concluſion.* Unleſs it be, if *Origen* aſſert, *That the Scriptures may be believed for themſelves, if* Gandavo *ſaith, That the Reſolution of Faith muſt be into God himſelf*, then the *Churches Authority* muſt be *Infallible*; but it appears already, that the Premiſes are true, and what then

Orig. περὶ ἀρχ. l. 4. c. 1. p. 88.

Ibid.

then remains but *therefore, &c.* which may indeed be liſted among your rare Argumentations for *Infallibility.*

2. *That Scripture cannot manifeſt it ſelf to be an infallible Light*; the proof of which is the deſign of your following Diſcourſe. Wherein you firſt Quarrel *with the Biſhop for his arguing from the Scriptures being a Light*; *for thence* (you ſay) *it will only follow, that the Scripture manifeſts it ſelf to be a Light, which you grant, but that it ſhould manifeſt it ſelf to be an Infallible Light you deny*; *for* (ſay you) *unleſs he could ſhew that there are no other Lights, ſave the Word of God, and ſuch as are Infallible, he can never make good his conſequence. For in* Seneca, Plutarch, Ariſtotle, *you read many Lights, and thoſe manifeſt themſelves to be Lights*; *but they do not therefore manifeſt themſelves to be Infallible Lights.* The ſubſtance of your Argument lies in this, *The Scripture diſcovers the Being of God*; *ſo doth the Talmud and Alcoran, as well as it*; *the Scripture delivers abundance of moral Inſtructions, but theſe may be found in multitudes of other Books, both of Chriſtians, and* Jews, *and Heathens*; *and as we do not thence infer, that theſe Books are Infallible, ſo neither can we that the Scriptures are.* This is the utmoſt of Senſe or Reaſon, which I can extract out of your Diſcourſe; which reduced into *Form*, will come to this. If the *Scriptures* contain nothing in them, but what may be found in other *Books* that are not *Infallible*, then the *Scriptures* cannot ſhew themſelves to be *Infallible*; but the antecedent is true, and therefore the conſequent. I could wiſh you would have taken a little more pains in proving that which muſt be your aſſumption, *viz. That Scripture contains nothing in it but what may be ſeen in* Seneca, Plutarch, Ariſtotle, *the* Talmud, Alcoran, *and other Books of* Jews *and Heathens.* Theſe are rare things to aſſert among *Chriſtians*, without offering at any more proof of them than you do, which lies in this *Syllogiſm. If Scripture contain ſome things* which may be ſeen in theſe *Books*, then it contains *nothing* but what may be ſeen in theſe *Books*; but the *Scripture* contains ſome things which may be ſeen in other Books, *viz. the exiſtence of God*, and *moral Inſtructions*; therefore it contains nothing but what is in them. And, Do you really think that you have now proved, that there is nothing in *Scripture* that can ſhew it ſelf to be *Infallible*, becauſe ſome things are common to other Writings. Would you not take it very ill, that any ſhould ſay that you had no more *Brains* than a *Horſe*, or a Creature of a like nature, becauſe they have *Senſe* and *Motion*, as well as you? Yet this is the very ſame Argument whereby you would prove that the *Scriptures* cannot ſhew themſelves to be *Divine*, becauſe the *Talmud*, *Alcoran*, and *Philoſophers*, have ſome things in them which the *Scripture* hath. But, Can you prove that the *Scripture* hath nothing elſe in it, but what may be found in any, or all of theſe Books? Will you undertake to ſhew any where ſuch *repreſentations* of the *Being* and *Attributes of God*, ſo ſuitable to the Conceptions which naturally flow from the *Idea* of a *Supream* and *Infinite Being*, and yet thoſe *Attributes* diſcovered in ſuch Contrivances for Man's *Good*, which the wit of Man could never have reached to; above all, in the *Reconciliation* of the World to himſelf by the Death of his *Son*? Will you find out ſo exact a *Rule* of Piety, conſiſting of ſuch *excellent Precepts*, ſuch *incouraging Promiſes* as are in *Scripture*, in any other writings whatſoever? Can you diſcover any where ſuch an unexpreſſible *energy* and force in a writing of ſo great *ſimplicity* and *plainneſs* as the *Scripture* is? Is there any thing unbecoming that *Authority*, which it awes the Conſciences of Men with? Is there any thing mean, trivial, fabulous, and impertinent in it? Are not all things written with that infinite *decorum* and ſui bleneſs,

§. 13.

P. 88, 89.

as

as do highly express the *Majesty* of him from whom it comes, but in the most sweet, affable, and condescending manner? Are there any such Arguments in the Writings of *Sencca*, *Plutarch*, *Aristotle*, for the Being of *God*, and *Immortality* of *Souls*, as there are in *Scripture?* Are there any *moral Instructions* built on such *good grounds*, carried on to so high a *degree*, written with that *life* and *vigour* in any of the *Heathen Philosophers*, as are in the *Scriptures?* How infinitely do the highest of them fall short of the *Scripture* in those very things, which they seem most to have in common with it? As, were it here a fit place, might be at large discovered. But, besides, and beyond all these, Are there not other *things* which evidence the *Divine Revelation* of the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*, which none of the *Writings* you mention, can in the least pretend to, *viz.* the accurate *Accomplishment* of *Prophecies*, and the abundance of *Miracles* wrought for the confirmation of the *Divine Testimony* of those who delivered this *Doctrine* to the World. And these very things now to us are *internal* to the *Scripture*, the *Motives* of *Faith* being delivered to us in the same Books that the *Doctrine* of *Faith* is: In which sense the *Scriptures* may well be said to be proved *Divine* by *themselves*, and that they appear *Infallible* by the *Light* which is in them, notwithstanding you most pitifully pretend to the contrary. And, if your *Church* will again pardon you for such opprobrious language of Scripture, as not only to compare the writings of *Seneca*, *Plutarch*, and *Aristotle* with it, which yet are commendable in their kind, for *moral Virtue*, and *natural Knowledge*; but those wretched and notorious Impostures of the *Alcoran*, and the fabulous Relations of the *Talmud*; if, I say, your *Church* will pardon such expressions as these, because they tend to inhance her *Infallibility*, well fare that *Pope*, who said *Heu quam minimo regitur mundus!*

As for your following instance *of a Candle lighted in a room, which shews that it is a light, but not who lighted it; so the sentences in Scripture are lights, and shew themselves to be such, but they cannot shew themselves to be such Infallible Lights which are produced by none but God himself:* I answer, That I commend your discretion in making choice of a *Candle* rather than of the *Light of the Sun* to set forth the *Scripture* by. For a *Candle* yields but a dim uncertain Light, may be put into a *dark Lanthorn*, and *snuffed* at pleasure; so would your *Church* fain pretend of the *Scripture*, that its *Light* is very *weak* and *uncertain*, that your *Church* must open the sides of the *Lanthorn* that it may give light, and make use of some *Apostolical Snuffers* of the *Pope's* keeping, to make it shine the *clearer*, though they often endanger the almost extinguishing of it; at least as to the generality of those who should enjoy the benefit of it. But because that poor *Light* of a *Candle* cannot shew who lighted it, Will not the *Light* of the *Sun* manifest it self to be no greater than that of a *Candle?* Cannot any one infer from the *vast extent* of that *light*, from the vanishing of it upon the *Sun's* setting, and its dispersing it self at his *rising*, that this *light* can proceed only from that great *luminous body* which is in the *Heavens?* And may we not proportionably infer, from the *clearness*, *greatness*, *majesty*, *coherency* of those *truths* revealed in *Scripture*, that they must certainly come from none but *God*; especially being joyned with those impregnable *evidences* which himself by the Persons who delivered them hath given that they were imployed by himself for that end? But because this is a matter of great consequence, give me leave to propound these questions to you, and after you have considered them seriously, return me a rational answer to them. 1. Doth it imply any repugnancy at all in the *nature* of the *thing*, or to the *nature* of

God,

God, that he ſhould reveal his mind to the World. 2. If it doth not, as I ſuppoſe you will grant that, Whether it is poſſible that *God* ſhould make it evident to the World that ſuch a *Revelation* is from himſelf? 3. If this be not impoſſible, Is it not neceſſary that it ſhould be ſo, ſuppoſing that *God* ſhould require the *belief* of a Doctrine ſo revealed on *pain* of *eternal Damnation* for not believing it? 4. Whether *God* may not give as great evidence of a *Revelation* that he makes of his Mind to the World, as he doth of his *Being*, from the *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs* and *Power*, which may be ſeen in the *Works* of *Creation*? 5. Whether any other way be conceivable that it ſhould be evident that a *Doctrine* comes from *God*, but that it contains things highly ſuitable to the *Divine Nature*, things above the *finding* out of *humane Reaſon*, things only tending to advance *Holineſs* and *Goodneſs* in the World, and this Doctrine to be delivered by Perſons who wrought unparallel'd *Miracles*? 6. Whether all theſe be not in the moſt evident manner imaginable contained in the *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*, and in the *Books* of *Scripture*? Which I leave any Man that hath common ſenſe to judge of? 7. Whether then it be not the higheſt diſparagement of this *Divine Doctrine* to make it ſtand in need of an Infallible Teſtimony of any company who ſhall take the boldneſs to call themſelves the *Catholick Church*, in order to the believing of it; and whether there can be any greater diſhonour done it, than to ſay it hath no more light to diſcover it ſelf Divine, than the *Writings of Philoſophers*, not to add of *Jews* and *Mahometans*? Theſe things I leave you and the Reader to conſider of, and proceed. What follows *concerning the Fathers and others proving the Scriptures to be the Word of God by themſelves, after they have believed them infallibly on other grounds*, is, *gratis dictum*, unleſs you can prove from the *Fathers*, that they did believe the *Scriptures infallibly* on other grounds. Which when you ſhall think fit to attempt I make no queſtion to anſwer, but in the mean time to a crude aſſertion it is enough to oppoſe a bare denial. Your following abſurdities concerning the *private Spirit*, *Infallible Aſſurance*, *Apoſtolical Tradition*, have been frequently examined already. Only what you ſay, *that you read, eſteem, nay very highly reverence the Scripture*; is but *Proteſtatio contra factum*, as may appear by your former expreſſions, and therefore can have no force at all with wiſe Men, who judge by *things*, and not by *bare words*. P. 90.

3. You ſay, *That if there were ſuch ſufficient light in Scripture to ſhew it ſelf, you ſhould ſee it as well as we; ſeeing you read it as diligently, and eſteem it as highly as we do.* What! *You* eſteem the *Scripture* as highly as we, who ſay, that the *Scripture appears no more of it ſelf to be God's Word, than diſtinction of colours to a blind Man! You*, who but in the Page before had ſaid, there was *no more light in Scripture to diſcover it ſelf, than in* Seneca, Plutarch, Ariſtotle, *nay, as to ſome things than the Talmud and Alcoran! You*, who ſay that, notwithſtanding the *Scriptures*, *Chriſt would have been eſteemed an Ignoramus an Impoſtor, if your Church be not Infallible!* Are you the Man, who *eſteem as highly of the Scriptures* as we do? May we not therefore juſtly return you your own language; and ſay, *that if you do not ſee this light in Scripture, it is becauſe your eyes are perverſe, your underſtanding unſanctified*, which inſtead of diſcovering ſuch Divine light in Scripture as to make you love and adore it, can have the confidence to utter ſuch expreſſions which tend ſo highly to the diſparagement of it. But did not his Lordſhip give before a ſufficient anſwer to this objection, by ſaying, 1. *That the light is ſufficient in it ſelf, but it doth not follow that it muſt be evident to every one that looks into it; for the blindneſs or perverſneſs of Men's Minds* §. 14. Ibid. n. 7. P. 86.

Minds may keep them from the discovery of it. 2. He saith, *This light is not so full a light as that of the first Principles, as, that the whole is greater than the part, that the same thing cannot be, and not be, at the same time.* And yet such is your Sincerity, you would seem at first to perswade the Reader of the contrary in your next *Paragraph*; but at last you grant that he denies it to be *evidently known as one of the Principles of the first sort.* (For you with your wonted subtilty distinguish *Principles known of themselves, into such as are either evidently, and such as are probably known of themselves,* i.e. *Principles known of themselves*, are either such as *are known of themselves*, or such *as are not*; for what is but *probably known*, is not certainly *known of it self*, but by that *probable argument* which causeth assent to it.) But when you deny *that the Scripture is so much as one of the second sort of Principles*, and say expressly, *That of it self it appears not so much as probably to be more the Word of God, than some other Book that is not truly such*; were you not so used to Contradictions, I would desire you to reconcile this expression, with what you said a little before of your high esteem and Reverence of the *Scriptures.*

3. *The Bishop saith, That when he speaks of this light in Scripture, he only means it of such a light as is of force to breed Faith, that it is the Word of God; not to make a perfect knowledge. Now Faith, of whatsoever it is, this, or other Principle, is an evidence, as well as knowledge; and the belief is firmer than any knowledge can be, because it rests upon Divine Authority, which cannot deceive; whereas knowledge (or at least he that thinks he knows) is not ever certain in deductions from Principles; but the Evidence is not so clear. Now God doth not require a full demonstrative knowledge in us that the Scripture is his Word, and therefore in his Providence hath kindled in it no light for that, but he requires our Faith of it, and such a certain demonstration as may fit that.* Now what answer do you return to all this? *Why*, forsooth, *We must have Certainty, nay, an Infallible Certainty, nay such an Infallible Certainty as is built on the Infallible Authority of the Church*, yet such an *Infallible Authority* as can be proved only by *Motives of Credibility*; which is a new kind of *Climax* in *Rhetorick*, viz. a *Ladder* standing with both *ends* upon *ground* at the same time. All the answer I shall therefore now give it, is, that your *Faith* then is *certain, Infallibly certain*, and yet built on but *probable Motives*, and therefore on your own *Principles* must be also *uncertain*, very *uncertain*, nay *undoubtedly* and *Infallibly uncertain.* What again follows concerning *Canonical Books* and the *private Spirit*, I must send them, as *Constables* do *Vagrants*, to the place from whence they came, and there they shall meet with a sufficient *Answer.*

§. 15. P. 91. &c. n. 8, 9. The remainder of this Chapter consists of a tedious vindication of *Bellarmine* and *Brierly*, which being of little consequence to the main business, I shall return the shorter answer. I shall not quarrel much with you about the interpretation of those words of *Bellarmine* in the sense you give them, *viz.* if they be understood of *absolute necessity, not of all Christians*, and *only in rare cases*, that it is not necessary to believe that there is Scripture, on supposition that the *Doctrine* of *Scripture* could be sufficiently conveyed to the minds of any without it, as in the case of the *Barbarous Nations* mentioned by *Irenæus.* But for you who make the Tradition of the present *Church Infallible*, and at the least the *Infallible conveyer* of the *Formal Object of Faith*; I do not see how you can avoid making it as *absolutely necessary* to be believed as any other *Object* of Faith: Unless your *Church* hath some other way of conveying Objects of Faith, than by propounding the *Scripture* infallibly to us. If therefore Men are bound to

De Eccles. l. 3. c. 14.

believe

believe things abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, becauſe contained in that *Book*, which the *Church* delivers to be the *Infallible Word of God*; I cannot poſſibly ſee, but the belief of the *Scripture* on the Churches Infallible Teſtimony muſt be as neceſſary *neceſſitate medii* as any thing contained in it. As for the Citation of *Hooker* by *Brierely*, whether it be falſified or no will beſt be ſeen by producing the ſcope and deſign of that worthy *Author* in the Teſtimonies cited out of him. Upon an impartial view of which in the ſeveral places referred to, I cannot but ſay, that if *Brierely*'s deſign was to ſhew that *Hooker* made the authority of the *Church* that into which *Faith* is laſtly reſolved, he doth evidently contradict Mr. *Hooker*'s deſign, and is therefore guilty of unfaithful repreſenting his meaning. For where he doth moſt fully and largely expreſs himſelf he uſeth theſe words, which for clearing his meaning muſt be fully produced. *Scripture teacheth all ſupernaturally revealed truth, without the knowledge where-* L. 3. ſect. 8. *of ſalvation cannot be attained. The main principle whereon the belief of all things therein contained dependeth, is, that the Scriptures are the Oracles of God himſelf. This in it ſelf we cannot ſay is evident. For then all Men that hear it would acknowledge it in heart, as they do when they hear that every whole is more than any part of that whole, becauſe this in it ſelf is evident. The other we know that all do not acknowledge it when they hear it. There muſt be therefore ſome former knowledge preſuppoſed, which doth herein aſſure the hearts of all believers. Scripture teacheth us that ſaving truth which God hath diſcovered to the world by Revelation, and it preſumeth us taught otherwiſe, that it ſelf is Divine and Sacred. The queſtion then being by what means we are taught this; ſome anſwer, That to learn it we have no other way than only Tradition: As namely that ſo we believe, becauſe both we from our predeceſſors, and they from theirs have ſo received. But is this enough? That which all Men's experience teacheth them, may not in any wiſe be denied. And by experience we all know, that the firſt Motive leading Men ſo to eſteem of the Scripture, is the Authority of God's Church. For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it even at the firſt an impudent thing for any Man bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cauſe. Afterwards the more we beſtow our labour in reading or hearing the myſteries thereof, the more we find that the thing it ſelf doth anſwer our receiv'd opinion concerning it. So that the former inducement prevailing ſomewhat with us before, doth how much more prevail, when the very thing hath miniſtred farther reaſon.* Can any thing be more plain (if Men's meaning may be gathered from their words, eſpecially when purpoſely they treat of a ſubject) than that *Hooker* makes the *Authority* of the *Church* the primary inducement to *Faith*, and that *rational evidence*, which diſcovers it ſelf in the *Doctrine* revealed to be that which it is finally reſolved into? For, as his Lordſhip ſaith on this very place of *Hooker*, P. 90. *The reſolution of Faith ever ſettles upon the fartheſt reaſon it can, not upon the firſt inducement.* By this place then where this *worthy Anthor* moſt clearly and fully delivers his judgment, we ought in reaſon to interpret all other occaſional and incidental paſſages on the ſame ſubject. So in that other place, *For whatſoever we believe concerning ſalvation by Chriſt although the* L. 2. ſect. 7. *Scripture be therein the ground of our belief, yet the authority of Man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scriptures.* I will not diſpute, wherher here he ſpeaks concerning the knowledge of *Scripture* to be *Scripture*, or concerning the natural ſenſe and meaning of *Scripture*: ſuppoſe I ſhould grant you the latter, it would make little for your purpoſe; for when he adds, *The Scripture doth not teach us*

the things that are of God, unless we did credit Men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signifie those things. You need not here *bid us stay a while:* For his sense is plain and obvious, *viz.* that Men cannot come to the natural sense and importance of the words used in *Scripture*, unless they rely on the *authority of Men* for the *signification* of those *words.* He speaks not here then at all concerning *Church-Tradition* properly taken, but meerly of the *authority of Man*, which he contends must in many cases be relied on, particularly in that of the sense and meaning of the *words* which occur in *Scripture.* Therefore with his Lordships leave and yours too, I do not think that in this place *Hooker* by the *authority of Man* doth understand *Church-Tradition*, but if I may so call it *Humane-Tradition*, *viz.* that which acquainteth us with the force and signification of *words* in *use.* When therefore you prove, that it is *Tradition* only, which is all the ground he puts of believing *Scripture* to be the *Word of God*, from those words of his, *That utterly to infringe the force and strength of Man's testimony, were to shake the very Fortress of God's truth. Now* (say you) *How can that Fortress (the Scriptures) be shaken, were not that authority esteemed by him the ground of that Fortress?* That may very easily be shewn, *viz.* by calling in question the *truth of humane testimony* in general; for he plainly speaks of such a kind of *humane testimony* as that is, whereby we know there is such a City as *Rome*, that such and such were *Popes* of *Rome*, wherein the ground of our perswasion can be nothing else but *humane testimony*; now take away the *credit* and *validity* of this *testimony*, the *very Fortress of truth* must needs be shaken; for we could never be certain that there were such persons, as *Moses*, the *Prophets*, *Christ* and his *Apostles* in the world, we could never be certain of the meaning of any thing written by them. But how far is this from the final resolution of Faith into *Church-Tradition?* But the place you lay the greatest force on, is that which you
L.2.sect.4. *first* cite out of him, *Finally we all believe that the Scriptures of God are sacred, and that they have proceeded from God; our selves we assure, that we do right well in so believing. We have for this a demonstration sound and Infallible. But it is not the Word of God which doth or can possibly assure us, that we do well to think it his Word.* From hence you infer, *that either he must settle no Infallible ground at all, or must say that the Tradition of the Church is that ground.* No *Infallible ground* in *your sense*, I grant it, but well enough in his own; for all the difficulty lies in understanding what he means by *Infallible*; which he takes not in your sense for a *supernatural*, but only for a *rational Infallibility*; not such a one as excludes *possibility of deception*, but all *reasonable doubting.* In which sense he saith of such
L.2.sect.8. things as are capable only of moral certainty, *That the Testimony of Man will stand as a ground of Infallible assurance*; and presently instanceth in these, *That there is such a City of* Rome, *that* Pius V. *was Pope there*, &c. So afterwards he saith, *That the mind of Man desireth evermore to know the truth according to the most Infallible certainty which the nature of things can yield:* by which it is plain, that the *utmost certainty* which things are capable of, is with him *Infallible certainty*; and so a sound and *Infallible ground* of Faith is a *certain ground*, which we all assert may be had without your Churches *Infallible Testimony.* Whether therefore *Brierely* and you are not guilty, if not of falsifying *Hooker*'s words, yet of perverting his meaning, let the *Impartial Reader* judge.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Churches Infallibility not proved from Scripture.

Some general conſiderations from the deſign of proving the Churches Infallibility from Scripture. No Infallibility in the High-Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law; if there had been, no neceſſity there ſhould be under the Goſpel. Of St. Baſil's *Teſtimony concerning Traditions. Scripture leſs liable to Corruption than Traditions. The great uncertainty of judging Traditions when Apoſtolical, when not. The Churches perpetuity being promiſed in Scripture proves not its Infallibility. His Lordſhip doth not falſifie* A. C.'s *words, but* T. C. *doth his meaning. Producing the Jeſuits words no traducing their Order.* T. C.'s *miſerable Apology for them. the particular Texts produced for the Churches Infallibility, examined. No ſuch Infallibility neceſſary in the Apoſtles Succeſſors as in Themſelves. The Similitude of Scripture and Tradition to an Ambaſſadour and his Credentials, rightly ſtated.*

§. 1. THE main deſign of this Chapter being to prove the *Infallibility* of the *Church* from the *Teſtimonies* of *Scripture*; before I come to a particular diſcuſſion of the matters contained in it, I ſhall make ſome general *Obſervations* on the ſcope and deſign of it, which may give more light to the particulars to be handled in it. 1. *That the Infallibility you challenge to the Church, is ſuch as muſt ſuppoſe a promiſe extant of it in Scripture:* Which is evident from the words of *A. C.* (which you own) to his Lordſhip, *That if he would conſider the Tradition of the Church, not only as it is the Tradition of a company of fallible Men, in which ſenſe the Authority of it is humane and fallible, but as the Tradition of a company of Men aſſiſted by Chriſt and his Holy Spirit; in that ſenſe he might eaſily find it more than an Introduction, indeed as much as would amount to an Infallible Motive.* Whence I infer, that in order to the *Churches Teſtimony* being an *Infallible Motive* to *Faith*, it muſt be believed that this *Company of Men* which make the *Church*, are *aſſiſted by Chriſt* and his *Holy Spirit*; Now I demand, Suppoſing there were no *Scripture* extant (the belief of which you ſaid before in defence of *Bellarmine*, was not neceſſary to Salvation) by what means could you prove ſuch an Infallible *Aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Spirit* in the *Catholick Church* in order to the perſwading an *Infidel* to believe? Could you to one that neither believes *Chriſt*, nor the *Holy Ghoſt*, prove evidently that your *Church* had an aſſiſtance of both theſe? You tell him that he cannot believe that there is a *Chriſt* or a *Holy Ghoſt*, unleſs he believes firſt your *Church* to be *Infallible*, and yet he cannot believe your *Church* to be *Infallible*, unleſs he believes there are ſuch things as *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; for that Infallibility, by your own confeſſion, doth ſuppoſe the peculiar *aſſiſtance* of both theſe. And can any one believe their *aſſiſtance*, before he believes they are? If you ſay, as you do, *By the Motives of Credibility you will prove your Church Infallible* (ſetting aſide the abſurdity of that which I have fully diſcovered already.) Is it poſſible for you to prove your *Church Infallible*, unleſs antecedently to the belief of your *Churches Infallibility*, you can prove to an *Infidel* the truth of theſe things?

1. That the *names of Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, are no *Chimerical Fancies and Ideas*, but that they do import *ſomething real*: Otherwiſe an *Infidel* would ſpeedily tell you, theſe *names* imported nothing but ſome kind of *Magical*

Spells which could keep Men from *errour*, as long as they carried them about with them. That as well might *Mahomet*, or any other *Impoſtor*, pretend an *Infallible Aſſiſtance* from ſome *Tutelar Angels*, with hard *Arabick names*, as you of *Chriſt*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, unleſs you can make it appear to him, that really there are ſuch *Beings* as *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; and when you have proved it to him, and he be upon your proof inclinable to believe it, you are bound to tell him by your *Doctrine*, that for all theſe *Proofs*, he can only *fancy* there are ſuch *Beings*, but he cannot really *believe* them, unleſs he firſt believes your *Church Infallible*. And when he tells you, *He cannot, according to your own Doctrine, believe that Infallibility, unleſs he believes the other firſt*, Would he not cry out upon you, as either lamentable *Fools*, that did not underſtand what you ſaid, or egregious *Impoſtors*, that play faſt and looſe with him, bidding him believe firſt one thing, and then another, till at laſt he may juſtly tell you, that in this manner he cannot be perſwaded to believe any thing at all? 2. Suppoſing he ſhould get through this, and believe that there were ſuch *Beings* as *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, he may juſtly ask you, 1. Whether there be nothing elſe but ſuch a kind of *Intellectus Agens*, as the *Arabick Philoſophers* imagined, ſome kind of *Being* which did aſſiſt the underſtanding in conception? You anſwer him *No*, but they are *real diſtinct perſonalities* of the ſame *nature* and *eſſence* with *God* himſelf; then he asks, 2. Whence doth this appear? For theſe being ſuch grand *difficulties*, you had need of ſome very clear evidence of them: If you ſend him to *Scripture*, he asks you, To what end? For the belief of that muſt ſuppoſe the *truth* of the *thing* in *queſtion*, that your *Church is Infallible* in delivery of this *Scripture* for *Divine Revelation*. But he further demands, 3. Whence comes that *Church* which you call *Infallible* to have this *Aſſiſtance* of both theſe? Do they aſſiſt all kind of Men to make them *Infallible?* You anſwer, *No*. But, Do they aſſiſt, though not all Men ſeparately, yet all ſocieties of Men conjunctly? You anſwer, *No*. Do they aſſiſt all Men only in *Religious Actions*, of what Religion ſoever they are? Still you anſwer, *No*. Do they aſſiſt then all Men of the *Chriſtian Religion* in their Societies? *No*, Do they aſſiſt all thoſe among the *Chriſtians*, who ſay, they have this *Aſſiſtance? No*. Do they thus aſſiſt all *Churches* to keep them from errour? *No*. *Whom* is it then that they do thus infallibly aſſiſt? You anſwer, The *Church*. But what *Church* do you mean? *The Catholick Church*. But, which is this *Catholick Church* (for, I hear, there are as great Controverſies about that, as any thing.) You muſt anſwer confidently, *That Church which is in the* Roman *Communion, is the true Catholick Church*. Have then all in that *Communion* this *Infallible Aſſiſtance? No*. Have all the *Biſhops* in this Communion it? *No*. Have all theſe *Biſhops* this *Aſſiſtance*, when met together? *Yes*, ſay you, *undoubtedly, if the Pope be their Head, and confirm their Acts*. Then it ſhould ſeem to me, that this *Infallible Aſſiſtance* is in the *Pope*, and he it is whom you call the *Catholick Church*: But ſurely he is a *very big Man* then, is he not? But, ſay you, *Theſe are Controverſies which are not neceſſary for you to know, it ſufficeth that the Catholick Church is the ſubject of Infallibility*. But, I had thought nothing could have been more neceſſary than to *have known this*: But I proceed then, How comes this *Catholick Church* to have this *Infallible Aſſiſtance?* Cannot I ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* and the *Holy Spirit* may exiſt without giving this *Aſſiſtance?* Cannot I ſuppoſe that *Chriſtian Religion* may be in the World, without ſuch an *Infallibility?* Is this *Aſſiſtance* therefore a *neceſſary*, or a *free* Act? A *free Act*. If a *free Act*, then, for all you know, Your *Catholick Church* may not be ſo aſſiſted: *No*, (you reply) *you are ſure it is ſo aſſiſted*. But, Whence can you be *ſure* of

an

an *arbitrary thing*, unleſs the *Authors* of this *Aſſiſtance* have engaged themſelves by *Promiſe*, to give your *Catholick Church that Infallible Aſſiſtance?* *Yes*, that they have (you reply) and then produce, *Luke* 10. 16. *Mat.* 28. 20. *John* 14. 16. But, although our *Infidel* might ask ſome untoward Queſtions ſtill; as, How you are ſure theſe are *Divine Promiſes*, when the knowledge that they are *Divine* muſt ſuppoſe the thing to be *true*, which you would prove out of them, *viz.* that your *Church is Infallible?* Suppoſing them *Divine*, how are you *ſure*, That, and no other, is the *meaning* of them, when from ſuch places you prove, that your *Church* is the only *Infallible Interpreter* of *Scripture?* But, I let paſs theſe, and other Queſtions, and ſatisfie my ſelf with this, *That it is impoſſible for you to prove ſuch an Infallible Aſſiſtance of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, unleſs you produce ſome expreſs Promiſe for it.*

2. This being impoſſible, it neceſſarily follows, *That the only Motives of Credibility, which can prove your Church Infallible, muſt be ſuch as do antecedently prove theſe Promiſes to be Divine.* This is ſo plain and evident a *Conſectary* from the former, that it were an *affront* upon humane underſtanding, to go about to prove it: For, if the *Infallibility* doth depend upon the *Promiſe*, nothing can prove that *Infallibility*, but what doth prove that *Promiſe* to be *True* and *Divine*: *True*, or elſe not to be believed; *Divine*, or elſe not to be relied on for ſuch an *Aſſiſtance*; none elſe being able to make a promiſe of it, but the Author of it. As therefore my right to an Eſtate as given by *Will*, depends wholly upon the *Truth* and *Validity* of that *Will*, which I muſt firſt prove, before I can challenge any *right* to it; So your pretence of *Infallibility* muſt ſolely depend upon the *Promiſes* which you challenge it by. By which it appears, that your attempting to prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, by *Motives* of *Credibility*, antecedent to, and independent on the *Scripture*, is vain, ridiculous, and deſtructive to that very *Infallibility* which you pretend to. Which, being by a *free Aſſiſtance* of *Chriſt* and his *Spirit*, muſt wholly depend on the proof of the *Promiſe* made of it. For, if you prove no *Promiſe*, all your *Motives of Credibility* prove nothing at all, as I have at large demonſtrated before, and ſhall not follow you in needleſs repetitions.

3. *No right to any priviledge can be challenged, by virtue of a free Promiſe made to particular perſons, unleſs it be evident that the intention of the Promiſer was, that it ſhould equally extend to them and others.* For the *Promiſe* being *free*, and the *Priviledge* ſuch as carries no neceſſity at all along with it, in order to the great ends of Chriſtian Religion; it is intolerable *Arrogance* and *Preſumption* to challenge it, without manifeſt evidence, that the deſign of it was for *them*, as well as the *Perſons* to whom it was made. Indeed, in ſuch *Promiſes* which are built on common and general *grounds*, containing things agreeable to all *Chriſtians*, it is but reaſonable to infer the univerſal *extent* of that *Promiſe* to all ſuch as are in the like condition. Hence the *Apoſtle* infers, from the particular Promiſe made to *Joſhua*, *I will never leave thee, nor forſake thee*; the effect of it upon all believers. Although, had not the *Apoſtle* done it before us, it may ſeem queſtionable on what ground we could have done it, unleſs from the general *reaſon* of it, and the unbounded nature of *Divine Goodneſs*, in things neceſſary for the *Good* of his *People*. But in things *arbitrary*, and ſuch as contain *ſpecial Priviledge* in them, to challenge a *right* to a Promiſe of the ſame Priviledge, without equal *evidence* of the deſcent of it, as the firſt *Grant*, is great preſumption, and a challenge of the *Promiſor* for *Partiality*, if he doth not make it good. Becauſe the pretence of the right of the *Priviledge* goes upon this ground, that it is as much due to the *Succeſſor*, as to the Original *Grantee*.

4. *No-*

4. *Nothing can be more unreaſonable, than to challenge a right to a Priviledge, by virtue of ſuch a Promiſe which was granted upon quite different conſiderations from the grounds on which that right is challenged.* Thus I ſhall after make it evident, that the Promiſe of an *Infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, had a peculiar reſpect to the *Apoſtles* preſent employment, and the firſt *ſtate* of the *Church*, that it was not made upon *reaſons* common to all Ages, *viz.* for the *Government of the Church*, *deciding Controverſies*, *Foundation of Faith*, all which Ends may be ſufficiently attained without them. But, above all, it ſeems very unreaſonable, that a *Promiſe* made to Perſons in *one office*, muſt be applied in the ſame manner to Perſons in a quite *different office*; that a Promiſe made to *each of them ſeparate*, muſt be equally applied to others *only as in Council*; that a *Promiſe* made implying *Divine Aſſiſtance*, muſt be equally applied to ſuch, who dare not ſay, that *Aſſiſtance* is *Divine* (but *Infallible*, and *after a ſort Divine*) that a *Promiſe* made of *immediate Divine Revelation*, and enabling the *Perſons* who enjoyed the Priviledge of it, *to work Miracles* to atteſt their Teſtimony to be *Infallible*, ſhould be equally applied to ſuch as dare not challenge a *Divine Revelation*, nor ever did *work a Miracle* to atteſt ſuch an *Infallible Aſſiſtance*. Yet all this is done by you in your endeavour of fetching the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, out of thoſe Promiſes of the *aſſiſtance* of *Chriſt* and his *Spirit*, which were made to the *Apoſtles*. Theſe general Conſiderations, do ſufficiently enervate the force of your whole Chapter, which yet I come particularly to conſider.

§. 2. Sect. 16. n. 26. His *Lordſhip* tells *A. C. That in the ſecond ſenſe of Church-Tradition, he cannot find that the Tradition of the preſent Church is of Divine and Infallible Authority, till* A. C. *can prove that this company of Men* (*the* Roman *Prelates and Clergy he means*) *are ſo fully, ſo clearly, ſo permanently aſſiſted by Chriſt, and his Spirit, as may reach to Infallibility, much leſs to a Divine Infallibility, in this or any other Principle which they teach.* In anſwer to this, you tell us, *That the Biſhop declines the Queſtion by withdrawing his Reader from the theſis, to the hypotheſis; from the Church, to the Church of* Rome. But, Is it not ſufficiently known to all Perſons who deal in this Controverſie, what you mean by the *Catholick Church* in this Controverſie, that it ſhall not be lawful *for his Lordſhip in a Parentheſis*, to ſhew where you place this *Infallibility*, but he muſt be charged with declining the Queſtion? This only ſhews a deſire to *cavil* at little things, when you were unable to anſwer greater. Beſides, in the way you take of proving the *Churches Infallibility* by the *Motives of Credibility*, there is a neceſſity even in this Controverſie, of declaring what that *Catholick Church* is, which muſt be known by theſe *Motives*; and therefore you have no cauſe to look upon this as running away from the Queſtion. *That* A. C. *after a long and ſilent attention, did meerly, through the heat of his zeal, become earneſt in this buſineſs, to do his Adverſary good.* I muſt believe it, becauſe you tell me ſo, though I ſee no great *Motive of Credibility* for it. And on that account did deſire him, *to conſider the Tradition of the Church, as of a company of Men infallibly aſſiſted. For ſuch aſſiſtance* (you ſay) *is neceſſary as well to have ſufficient aſſurance of the true Canon of Holy Scripture, as to come to the true meaning and interpretation thereof.* But this is as eaſily denied as ſaid. We wait therefore for your Proofs.

P. 98. n. 1.

P. 91. n. 26. That which only ſeems here intended for that end, is, That *when the Relator had ſaid, The Prophets under the Old Teſtament, and the Apoſtles under the New, had ſuch an Infallible Divine Aſſiſtance; but neither the High Prieſt with his Clergy in the Old, nor any Company of Prelates or Prieſts in the New, ſince the*

the Apoſtles, ever had it. To this you reply, *That the like aſſiſtance (with the Prophets and Apoſtles) the High Prieſt with his Clergy had in the Old Teſtament, as we gather out of* Deut. 17. 8. *&c. Where in doubts the people were bound, not only to have recourſe to the High Prieſt and his Clergy, but to ſubmit and ſtand to their judgment. Much more then ought we to think, that there is ſuch an obligation in the New Teſtament; which could not ſtand without Infallibility. Witneſs the infinite diſſentions and diviſions in Points of Faith, amongſt all the different Chriſtians that deny it.* P. 97. B. 1.

Two things the force of this argument lies in. 1. *That there was Infallibility in the High Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law.* 2. *That if there were ſo then, there ought to be ſo now.* Both theſe muſt be conſidered.

1. *That there was Infallibility in the High Prieſt and his Clergy under the Law,* which you prove from *Deut.* 17. 8. *Becauſe there the people were not only to have recourſe to them, but to ſubmit and ſtand to their judgment.* This argument in form, is this. Where there is to be not only a recourſe, but an *obligation to ſubmiſſion*, there muſt be *Infallibility*; but there were both theſe among the *Jews*, as to the *High Prieſt and his Clergy*; *ergo.* You may ſee how forcible this argument is in a like caſe: Where there is to be not only a recourſe in matters of difficulty, but an obligation to *ſubmit* and ſtand to their *judgment*, there muſt be *Infallibility*; but to the *Parliament* of *England* there ought to be not only a recourſe in matters of *difficulty*, but a *ſubmiſſion to their judgment*; therefore the *Parliament* of *England* is as *infallible* as the *High Prieſt and Clergy* under the *Law*, by the very argument by you produced. The ſame will hold for all *Courts of Juſtice.* But, Can you by no means diſtinguiſh between an *obligation to ſubmiſſion*, and an *obligation in conſcience to aſſent* to what is determined as *infallibly true?* Is every perſon in all judiciary *Caſes*, where ſubmiſſion is required, bound to believe the *Judges* ſentence *infallible?* If ſo, we need not go over the *Alps* for *Infallibility*, we may have it much cheaper at home: But, I ſuppoſe you will reply, The caſe is very different, becauſe in the Text by you produced, 1. *Not Civil Matters*, but *Religious* are ſpoken of. 2. That not any *Civil Magiſtrates*, but the *High Prieſt and his Clergy* are the *Judges* mentioned. 3. That not every kind of *Judgment*, but an *Infallible Judgment* is there ſet down. But, if every one of theſe be falſe, you will ſee, what little advantage comes to your cauſe by this Teſtimony; which I ſhall in order demonſtrate.

1. That this place ſpeaks not of *Religious Cauſes*, as ſuch; but of *Civil Cauſes*, *i. e.* not of *matters of Doctrine* to be decided as *true* or *falſe*, but *matters* of *Juſtice* to be determined as to *right* and *wrong.* Not but that ſome things concerning the *Eccleſiaſtical Polity* of the Nation might be there decided; for it was impoſſible in a Nation, whoſe *Laws* depended on their *Religion*, to ſeparate the one from the other: But, that the *Judgement* given there, did not determine the *truth* and *falſhood* of things, ſo as to oblige *Men's Conſciences* to believe them; but did ſo peremptorily decide them, that the perſons concerned were bound to acquieſce in that determination. For the proof of this, one would think, the very reading of the place were ſufficient. *If there ariſe a matter too hard for thee in Judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between ſtroke and ſtroke, being matters of controverſie within thy gates, then ſhalt thou ariſe and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe,* &c. Which words are ſo generally expreſſed, on purpoſe to take in all manner of controverſies which might riſe among them, whether civil, criminal, or ceremonial. And herein *God* makes proviſion againſt any *rupture* which might be among them upon any emergent Controverſie, by eſtabliſhing a *Court of Appeals*, to which all Deut. 17. 8.

ſuch

ſuch cauſes ſhould be brought, in which the leſſer *Courts* could not agree. For that ſeems to be the main ſcope of the words, by the following expreſſion of *Controverſies within thy gates*, by which it ſeems evident, that the *Controverſies* were ſuch as could come to no *reſolution* in thoſe inferiour *Courts* which ſate in the *Gates of the Cities*; by which it appears, that theſe could be no momentous *Controverſies* of *Religion*, which never came under the cognizance of thoſe *inferiour* and *ſubordinate Courts*. By theſe words then *God* doth erect a *Supreme Court* of *Judicature* among them, to which they might *appeal*, not only in caſe of *injury*, but in caſe of difficulty; and thoſe leſſer *Courts*, as well as particular *perſons*, were to *ſubmit* to the *Decree* of the great *Sanhedrin*, ſitting in the place which *God* ſhould chuſe, which was *Shilo* firſt, and *Hieruſalem* after. And thence *Maimonides* ſo often ſaith, That the eſtabliſhment and coagmentation of all the *Iſraelites*, did depend upon this place; for hereby *God* ſet up ſuch a Tribunal, to which the *laſt Reſort* ſhould be made, and from whoſe determinations there ſhould remain no further appeal. And according to the *Tradition* of the *Jews*, theſe appeals were to be *gradual*, *i. e.* in caſe any Prieſt ſhould be to ſeek as to any *Ceremonial Cauſe*, as that of *Leproſie*, brought before him, he was to take advice of the *Court* of the *Triumvirate* where he lived; if that did not agree, then he was to appeal to the leſſer *Sanhedrin* of 23. in the neighbour-City; if there it could not be ended, to the *Sanhedrin* of 23. at the entrance of the Mount of the *Temple*; if not there neither, then *appeal* was made to the *Great Sanhedrin*, whoſe ſentence was final and *peremptory*, and was inſtead of a *Law* in the *Caſe*.

2. You are greatly miſtaken in ſuppoſing that all this is ſpoken of the *High Prieſt and his Clergy*: I deny not but expreſs mention is made of the *Prieſts* and *Levites*, as thoſe who were ſuppoſed moſt acquainted with all matters of *difference* which ſhould happen among them; and therefore were probably the greateſt part of the great *Sanhedrin* (for it is a groundleſs fancy to ſuppoſe two diſtinct *Courts*, the one *Civil*, and the other *Eccleſiaſtical* among the *Jews*.) Nay the *High Prieſt* himſelf was ſo far from being the conſtant *Preſident* of this *Court*, that, if we believe the *Tradition* of the *Jews*, he was not admitted to ſit there, without the ſame previous examination and tryal which others underwent. Indeed, in the decay of the *Jewiſh Polity*, in the time of the *Aſſomanean Family*, the chief Civil Power was in the hands of the *High Prieſt*, on which account he might then preſide in the *Sanhedrin*, but that is nothing to this place, where mention is made *verſe* 9. of the *Prieſts* and *Levites*, and then of the *Judge*, which is, in caſe *God* ſhould raiſe up among them an *extraordinary perſon*, who ſhould be *Judge over Iſrael*, then the *appeals* might be to him; but otherwiſe *verſe* 10. *they were to do according to the ſentence, which they of that place which the Lord ſhall chuſe, ſhall ſhew thee*, which was the *great Sanhedrin*. According therefore to the ſentence of this Court, whether pronounced by a *Prieſt*, or other, they were to act; and they that refuſed were puniſhed with death.

3. Whoever the *perſons* were, who gave this Sentence, yet it was not looked on as *Infallible*; for it is not ſaid, *Whoſoever doth not believe the judgment given, to be infallibly true*; but, *whoſoever acts contumaciouſly in oppoſition to it. And the Man that will do preſumptuouſly, and will not hearken unto the Prieſt, or unto the Judge, even that Man ſhall dye*. Beſides, we are ſo far from reading of any promiſe of *Infallibility* made to the *High Prieſt* and his *Clergy*, or to the *Sanhedrin*, that *God* himſelf doth ſuppoſe a poſſibility of errour in the whole *Congregation of Iſrael*, Levit. 4. 15. And all along the Books of the *Prophets*, we ſee how much *God* chargeth the *Prieſts* with *Ignorance*, and

Deut. 17. 12.

and *forsaking his way.* And, I pray, Where was that *Infallibility* of the *High Priest* and his *Clergy*, not only when our blessed *Saviour* was condemned by him, and the *Sanhedrin* both; but in that time, *when Israel for a long season had been without the True God, and without a Teaching Priest, and without Law?* So that we see what very little relief you have out of this place for the Infallibility of the *High Priest and his Clergy.* But, suppose we should grant them *Infallible*, and that *Infallibility* proved from this place, What is that to us? Might not you as well challenge the *Oracular Responses* by *Urim* and *Thummim* to belong to you, as the *High Priest's Infallibility*, supposing he had any? If *God* thought it fit to make them *Infallible*, and gave such express command concerning obedience and submission to their judgment, Is it not very reasonable to think, that under the *Gospel* there should be express mention made of the subject of this *Infallibility*, the place whither we should resort for *final judgments*, as there is here? Nay, had it not been far more necessary to have specified and determined these circumstances, since they are of such vast *importance* for the peace of the *Christian world?* How *easily* had all our debates been ended, if *God* had said any where in the New Testament, *When any Controversie of Faith ariseth, go to the place which I shall chuse*, viz. *Rome, and there enquire* the judgment of *the Bishop that shall sit there, and whatever he determines, that believe as infallibly true:* if we had met with any thing so express, nay, that had any seeming tendency this way, How readily should we submit our *Controversies* to his determination; But, when there is so little ground or foundation for it there, that you are fain to deduce your Infallibility, from *God's settling a Court of Appeals* among the *Jews*; Can you think that we are presumptuous, *and deserve to be cut off, if we do not believe?* For, for all that I know, you may challenge the *sanction of the Law*, as well as the *Privilegde of it*; and your former practices would perswade us, that you believe the *Sanction* to be as valid as the other.

2 Chron. 15. 3.

But (say you) *the infinite dissentions and divisions among those that deny it, make this necessary.* 1. I pray, Doth your pretence of *Infallibility* put an end to all your *divisions?* Nay, Are there not many among your selves, raised meerly on the account of this *Infallibility?* Have not many among you, grown so weary of it, that they have wished the name had never been mentioned? Are not others so ashamed of the thred-bare impertinent places of *Scripture*, commonly produced, that they have ventured the censure of your *Church* for disowning them, and have sheltred themselves under the *Infallibility* of *Universal Tradition?* Have not some ingenuously confessed, that there is no avoiding the *circle* on the common grounds? Are those no differences at all concerning the subject of *Infallibility*, and the *Superiority of Pope and Council?* Happy Men! that have so many *coincident distinctions*, and such *agreeing differences!* 2. Were there not *dissentions and divisions* in the *Apostles times?* And, had it not been, think you, much better for the *Apostle*, instead of saying, *There must be hereses or divisions among you, that they which are approved, may be made manifest*, to have told them, There must be an *Infallible Judge* among you, that there may be no *hereses* or *divisions?* If you had been at his *Elbow*, what prudent advice you would have given S. *Paul* for ending all the *divisions* in the *Corinthian, Colossian, Galatian Churches, &c.!* You must have told him, that it was to very little purpose to *wooe them* by the many arguments he useth to exhort them so often to unity, and chide them as *carnal*, while they had dissentions, when one word of an *Infallible Judge* had ended all of them. But, poor S. *Paul* knew of no such thing, which made him give as *good*

counſels, as the *Spirit of God* directed him to; but alas, they were but ſorry things in compariſon of an *Infallible Judge*. Give us leave therefore to reckon our ſelves among thoſe *Primitive Chriſtians*, who knew no more than we of any ſuch way to end differences, as *Infallibility* in a conſtant *Judge*; for all they had diſſentions and diviſions among them as well as we.

But you are very angry with his *Lordſhip* for taxing this pretence of *Infallibility* with *Inſolency*, and a deſign to *Lord it over the Faith of Chriſtendom*. And therefore tell him, *You go no further than Chriſt himſelf leads you by Promiſes made of this Infallibility*; That is the thing in queſtion, and muſt not be taken upon the truſt of your *Infallibility*, in *interpreting* the *places* by you alledged. When you can prove the *Paſtors* of your *Church*, to be as *Infallible* as the *Apoſtles* were, and to have the ſame *Spirit* which they had, I ſhall as little ſuſpect them of *Lording it over others as the Apoſtles*: but if it appear quite otherwiſe as to the *Paſtors of your Church*; name, if you can, a greater *Inſolency*, than to uſurp a power of preſcribing to the *Faith* of the *Chriſtian world*. As to what follows concerning your *Churches Teſtimony*, being again *Infallible* by the *aſſiſtance of Chriſt and his Spirit*, and yet not *Divinely Infallible*, it is ſo ſubtile and Scholaſtical a diſtinction, that I now begin, not to admire your ſo often uſing it; for I ſee plainly, if that *wedge*, how blunt ſoever, doth not rive aſunder the *knot*, it is like to remain for any thing you have to ſay to it.

His Lordſhip having given one Inſtance of the *Inſolency* of your pretence of *Infallibility*, by the *dangerous errours which your Church doth hold, particularly in equalling the Tradition of the preſent Church to the written Word of God, which* (ſaith he) *is a Doctrine unknown to the Primitive Church, and which frets upon the very Foundation it ſelf, by juſtling with it*. But, being well acquainted with the Arts of your party in making a great noiſe with the *Fathers*, and particularly in this *Controverſie*, with a *citation* out of S. *Baſil*'s *Books de Spirit. Sanct. ad Amphilochium*, and eſpecially thoſe words, *parem vim habent ad pietatem*, ſpeaking of *Traditions*; he therefore in his Margent ſo far takes notice of them, as to return this threefold Anſwer to them. 1. *That he ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Tradition, and not the Tradition of the preſent Church.* 2. *That exceptions are taken at this Book as corrupted.* 3. *That S.* Baſil *makes Scripture the Touchſtone of Tradition.* To this you return a threefold Anſwer. 1. *That 'tis true, he ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Traditions, but of ſuch as were come down to their preſent times.* 2. *That the exceptions againſt the Book are unreaſonable.* 3. *That S.* Baſil *doth not make the Scripture ſo to be the touchſtone of Tradition, as that Scripture muſt needs therefore be of greater force and ſuperiour dignity than that of Tradition.* Becauſe therefore this is the chief place in *Antiquity* which is produced on your ſide in behalf of *Traditions*, it will deſerve a more careful examination in the particulars by you mentioned.

1. You acknowledge that he ſpeaks of *Apoſtolical Traditions* and ſuch as the preſent *Church* judged *Apoſtolical*; now you ſay that the preſent *Church* is infallible in judging *Apoſtolical Traditions*, and what Traditions are ſo judged are neceſſary to be practiſed. Now I pray conſider what difficulties and ſelf-contradictions you have brought your ſelf into, by acknowledging theſe *Traditions* to have been judged *Apoſtolical* by the *preſent Church*. For either that *Church* at that time was not *Infallible* in judging *Traditions*, and ſo the *preſent Church* of every *age* is not *Infallible*; or if that was *infallible*, *yours* is *not*; for your *Church* differs from the *Church* in S. *Baſil*'s time about theſe very *Traditions* by him mentioned, your *Church* not judging them *Apoſtolical*. Which will appear by an inſpection into

into those things which are here accounted *Traditions* by him. Among which he not only mentions *signing believers with the sign of the Cross, praying toward the East, the oyl and the abrenunciation used in Baptism*, but *the consecration of the Person to be Baptized, the standing at Prayers until Pentecost*, and above all, *the trine immersion in Baptism*, all which he saith come ἐκ τῆς ἀδημοσιεύτου ταύτης, καὶ ἀποῤῥήτου διδασκαλίας, ἣν ἐν ἀπολυπραγμονήτῳ καὶ ἀπεριεργάστῳ σιγῇ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐφύλαξαν, *Out of a secret and unpublished Tradition, which our Fathers preserved in a quiet and silent manner.* Are these three last then acknowledged by your *Church* now for *Apostolical Traditions* or no? Nay, doth not your *Roman Catechism* absolutely pronounce the *trine immersion* to be unnecessary for Baptism? How can that become *unnecessary*, which was once *Infallibly* judged to be an *Apostolical Tradition?* Either the *Church* then was out in her judgment, or your *Church* out in hers; and choose whether of those you have the more mind to? Either of them will help you to contradict your self.

S. Basil de Sp. S. c. 27. Tom. 1.

Catechism. Rom. de baptis.

2. There want not sufficient *reasons* of suspecting that Book to be *corrupted.* You say *Erasmus* was the *first* who suspected it. Not the *first* who suspected corruption in St. *Basil*'s writings. For *Marcus Ephesius* in the *Florentine Council* charged some *Latinizing Greeks* with corrupting his Books against *Eunomius*, protesting that in *Constantinople* there were but four *Copies* to above one thousand which had the *passages* in them, which were produced by the *Latins.* But suppose *Erasmus* were the *first:* was he not so in discovering the genuine and supposititious writings of several others of the *Fathers*? We must therefore enquire into the *reason* which *Erasmus* had of this suspicion; Who tells us in his Epistle to *John Dantiscus* the *Poland Ambassadour*, that by that time he had gone through half this work he discerned a palpable inequality in the style, sometimes swelling to a *Tragical* height, and then sinking into a vulgar flatness, having much more of ostentation, impertinent digression, repetitions, than any of St. *Basil*'s own writings, which had always a great deal of vigour, simplicity and candour, with great evenness and equality, *&c.* And although this argument to all that know the worth of that *excellent* Person, especially in his judgment of the *writings* of the *Fathers*, will seem by no means contemptible, yet we have much greater reason for our suspicion than this meerly from the *stile.* For if you believe St. *Basil* was a Man who knew how to speak consistencies, that he would not utter palpable and evident contradictions in his writings; you will have no reason to applaud your self in this as a genuine piece of St. *Basil*'s, at least for the latter part of it. For whereas you make this the force of his words, That *unwritten Traditions have equal force to stir up Piety, with the written Word:* You could hardly have numed so many words which bear a greater face of contradiction to a multitude of testimonies in his unquestionable genuine writings. For, is it not St. *Basil* who saith, *That it is a manifest falling from the Faith, and an argument of arrogancy, either to reject any point of those things that are written, or to bring in any of those things that are not written?* Is it not St. *Basil* who bids a Man *Believe the things that are written, and seek not the things that are written?* Is it not the same St. *Basil*, who saith, *That every word and action ought to be confirmed by the Testimony of Holy Scripture for confirmation of the Faith of the good, and confusion*

Concil. Florent. Act. 20.

Φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων. Basil. de verâ ac piâ fide. Tom. 2. op. gr. lat. p. 386.

Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίστευε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζήτει. Hom. 29. de Trinit. Tom. 1.

Ὅτι δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα, ἢ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, εἰς πλυροφορίαν μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἐντροπὴν δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν. In Ethicis. Reg. 16. v. Tom. 2.

Πᾶν τὸ ἐκτὸς τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὄν, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. Ib. reg. 80. c. 22.

confuſion of the evil? Is it not he who urgeth that very place to this purpoſe, *Whatſoever is not of Faith is Sin*; then whatſoever is without the Holy Scripture, being not of Faith, is Sin. Which at leaſt muſt be underſtood of ſuch things which Men have an opinion of piety and neceſſity in the doing of. Theſe and many other places may be produced out of his genuine *writings* atteſting the clean contrary to what you produce this place for. What then muſt we think of him? Muſt we ſay of him as he did of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, that he ſpoke ſome things not δογματικῶς but ἀγωνιστικῶς, not as though he believed them; but for *diſputation* ſake, becauſe they ſerved his purpoſe well? Or rather, have we not much greater reaſon conſidering the contrariety of the *Doctrine*, as well as inequality of *ſtile*, to follow *Eraſmus* his judgment concerning this Book? Eſpecially conſidering that *Bellarmine* himſelf, who ſlights *Eraſmus* his judgment herein; yet when he is pinched with a citation out of his *Aſceticks*, calls the ſincerity of that Book into queſtion, becauſe he doth not therein ſeem to admit of *unwritten Traditions*, *which* (ſaith he) *ad Amphilochium he doth ſtrenuouſly defend.* If therefore he may queſtion another Book for not agreeing with *this*, we may more juſtly queſtion this for diſagreeing with ſo many *others*. Thus you ſee, it is not meerly the *ſtile*, and that only on the judgment of *Eraſmus*, which makes this Book ſuſpicious. And from thoſe citations produced out of other writings of St. *Baſil*, the (3.) thing evidently appears, *viz.* That he ſo makes the *Scripture* the Touchſtone of all *Traditions*, as that *Scripture* muſt be incomparably of greater force and ſuperiour dignity, than any unwritten *Tradition* whatſoever. But *Whether* Stapleton *in his teſtimony meant primarily Apoſtolical Traditions, or others*, is not worth the enquiring.

Baſil. ep. 64.

L. 4. de V. D. c. 7. De Amiſſ. Grat. l. 1. c. 13.

§. 4.] Concerning what follows, *as to the ſincerity and agreement of ancient Copies of Scripture, and the means to be aſſured of the integrity of them*, I have ſufficiently expreſſed my ſelf already. Only what you add concerning the *Integrity of Traditions above the Scripture*, being new, deſerves to be conſidered. *For*, (ſay you) *univerſal Traditions are recorded in Authors of every ſucceeding Age: And it ſeems much more incident to have errours ſlip into writings of ſo great bulk as is the Bible, which in their Editions paſs only through the hands of particular Men, than that there ſhould be errours in publick, univerſal, and immemorial Traditions, which are openly practiſed throughout* Chriſtendome, *and taken notice of by every one in all Ages. And from hence you inſtance in S.* John's *Epiſtle, or St.* Luke's *Goſpel, which being originally written to particular Perſons, muſt be at firſt received as authentical upon their credit: But, on the other ſide, Apoſtolical Traditions* (for which you inſtance in the *Obſervation of the Lord's-day, Infant Baptiſm, uſe of Altars*, &c.) *in their prime inſtitution and practice being publickly practiſed and owned by the Apoſtles; it was incomparably harder, morally ſpeaking, to doubt in the beginning of theſe Traditions, than whether St.* John's *Epiſtle, or St.* Luke's *Goſpel were really theirs or no. Whence we ſee ſome Books that were written by Apoſtles were queſtioned for ſome time, but theſe and ſuch like Traditions, were always owned, as truly and really deſcending from the Apoſtles.* To which I anſwer, 1. If you prove not ſome *Tradition* thus univerſally owned and received which we have no *record* of, or ground for the obſervation of from *Scripture*, you ſpeak nothing at all to the purpoſe; but two of thoſe you inſtance in, *Obſervation of the Lord's Day*, and *Pædobaptiſm*, we have as much as is requiſite for the *Churches* practice from *Scripture* it ſelf; for the other, Of the uſe of *Altars*, it were a work becoming you to deduce the Hiſtory of them from the *Apoſtolical times*, beginning at the ὑπερῶον, or *upper room* where the *Apoſtles* met after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, and

Ibid. n. 2.

ſo

ſo tracing them through all the private *Houſes* and *Synagogues* in which the *Chriſtians* in the *Apoſtles times* had their ſolemn Aſſemblies for Divine Worſhip; thence bringing down the Hiſtory of them carefully through all the *Perſecutions*, and producing evidences to that purpoſe, out of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Minutius Felix*, and *Arnobius*, only blotting out *non* where they ſpeak of *Altars* and *Temples* among *Chriſtians*, and telling us that ſome *Proteſtants* had corrupted their Books; that where they utterly diſown them, they did highly magnifie them, that where they ſeemed to ſpeak moſt againſt them, it was not to let the *Heathens* know that they had them: By this means indeed you are like to acquaint us with ſome *Univerſal Tradition* leſs liable to corruption and alteration than the *Scriptures*. For this of *Altars* is the only thing by you mentioned, which ſeems any thing to your purpoſe, the other two being ſufficiently proved from *Scripture*; which acquaints us ſo much with *Apoſtolical practice*, as to yield abundant reaſon for the practice of following *Ages*. You do well therefore to wrap up all other ſuch *Traditions* as might vye with the *Scriptures* for integrity, in a *prudent*, &c. For you cannot but know that this game of *Tradition* is quite ſpoiled, if we offer to come to particulars. But it is a fine thing in general to talk of the *impoſſibility* of *corrupting* ſuch a *Tradition* as had its riſe from the practice of the *Apoſtles*, and was by them delivered to ſucceeding ages, and ſo was univerſally practiſed by all *Chriſtians* as derived from the *Apoſtles*; but when we put but that ſullen *demand*, that ſuch a thing as hath no evidence in *Scripture* may be *named* which was ſo univerſally received and owned as the *Scriptures* are, how many put *off's*, and *&c.'s*. do we meet withal for fear of being evidently diſproved in the particular inſtanced in? 2. If there be ſo much greater evidence for *Tradition* than *Scripture*, whence came the very next *Ages* to the *Apoſtles* to be ſo doubtful as to *Traditions*, which yet were agreed in receiving the *Scripture?* I ſpeak not of ſuch things, which we have not the leaſt evidence the *Apoſtles* ever thought of, much leſs univerſally practiſed (ſuch as we contend the things in controverſie between you and us are) but in ſuch things which undoubtedly the *Apoſtles* did practiſe, ſo as that the *Chriſtians* of that *Age* could not but know ſuch a practice of theirs. As in that Controverſie which ſoon riſe in the *Church*, about the day of the *Obſervation* of *Eaſter*; what conteſts ſoon grew between the *Aſian* and *Roman Chriſtians* about this, both equally pretending *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and that at the leaſt diſtance imaginable from the *Apoſtolical times?* For *Polycarp* profeſſed to receive his Tradition from St. *John*, as thoſe at *Rome* from St. *Peter*. If then *Traditions* be ſo uncapable of *falſification* and corruption, how came they to be ſo much to ſeek, as to what the *Apoſtolical Tradition* was in the very next Age ſucceeding the *Apoſtles?* What, Could not thoſe who lived in St. *John's* and St. *Peter's* time know what they did? Could they be deceived themſelves, or had they an intent to deceive their Poſterity? If ſome of them did falſifie *Tradition* ſo ſoon, we ſee what little *certainty* there is in the deriving a *Tradition* from the *Apoſtles:* If neither falſified, then it ſhould ſeem there was no univerſal *practice* of the *Apoſtles* concerning it, but they looked on it as a matter of *indifferency*, and ſome might practiſe one way, and ſome another. If ſo, then we are yet further to ſeek for an *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Apoſtles*, binding ſucceeding *Ages*. For can you poſſibly think the *Apoſtles* did intend to bind unalterably ſucceeding Ages in ſuch things which they uſed a *Liberty* in themſelves? If then it be granted, that in matters of an *indifferent nature* the *Apoſtles* might practiſe ſeverally as they ſaw occaſion, How then can we be *certain* of the *Apoſtles univerſal practice* in

in matters of an *indifferent nature?* If we cannot ſo, we can have no evidence of an *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Apoſtles*, but in ſome things which they judged neceſſary. But whence ſhall we have this unqueſtionable evidence, *firſt*, that they did ſuch *things*, and *ſecondly*, that they did them with an apprehenſion of the *neceſſity* of them, and with an intention to oblige poſterity by their actions? By what rule or meaſure muſt we judge of this neceſſity? By their *univerſal practice?* But that brings us into a plain *Circle*; for we muſt judge of the *neceſſity* of it by their *univerſal practice*, and we muſt prove that *univerſal practice* by the *neceſſity* of the thing. For, if the thing were not judged neceſſary, the *Apoſtles* might differ in their *practice* from one another. Whence then ſhall we prove any *practice* neceſſary, unleſs built on ſome *unalterable* ground of reaſon, and then it is not *formally* an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, but the *uſe* of that common reaſon and prudence in matters of a religious nature: Or elſe by ſome poſitive *Law* and *Inſtitution* of theirs; and this, ſuppoſing it unwritten, muſt be evidenced from ſomething diſtinct from their practice, or elſe you muſt aſſert, that whatever the *Apoſtles* did, they made an unalterable *Law* for; or laſtly, you muſt quit all *Unwritten Traditions* as *Univerſal*, and muſt firſt infer the *neceſſity*, and then the *Univerſality* of their practice from ſome *record* extant in *Scripture*, and then you can be no further certain of any *Univerſal practice* of the *Apoſtles*, than you are of the *Scriptures*: By which it will certainly appear that the *Scripture* is far more evident and credible, than any *univerſal unwritten Tradition*.

A clear and evident Inſtance of the uncertainty of knowing Apoſtolical Traditions in things not defined in Scripture, is one of thoſe you inſtance in your ſelf, *viz.* that of *Rebaptizing Hereticks*, which came to be ſo great a *Controverſie*, ſo ſoon after the *Apoſtolical Age*. For though this Controverſie roſe to its height in St. *Cyprian*'s time, which was about *A. D.* 250. yet it was begun ſome competent time before that. For St. *Cyprian*, in his Epiſtle to *Jubaianus*, where he gives an account of the *General Council* of the *Provinces* of *Africa and Numidia*, conſiſting of ſeventy one *Biſhops*, endeavours to remove all ſuſpicion of Novelty from their opinion, *For* (ſaith he) *it is no new or ſudden thing among us to judge that thoſe ought to be baptized, who come to the Church from Hereticks; for now many years are paſt, and a long time, ſince, under* Agrippinus, *the Biſhops meeting together did determine it in Council, and thouſands of Hereticks have voluntarily ſubmitted to it.* How far off could that be from the *Apoſtolical* times, which was done ſo long before *Cyprians?* And, although St. *Auguſtine* (as it was his intereſt ſo to do) would make this to have been but a *few years*; yet we have greater evidence both of the greater antiquity, and larger ſpread of this Opinion. Whereby we may ſee, how little the judgment of *Vincentius Lirinenſis* is to be relied on as to Traditions, who gives *Agrippinus* ſuch hard words, *for being the firſt who againſt Scripture, the Rule of the Univerſal Church, the judgment of all his Fellow-Prieſts, the Cuſtom of his Anceſtors, did aſſert the Rebaptization of Hereticks.* How little Truth there is in what *Vincentius* here ſays, and conſequently, how little certainty in his way of finding out Traditions, will appear from the words of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, in his Epiſtle to *Philemon* and *Dionyſius* concerning this ſubject. For therein he aſſerts, *That*

Apud nos autem, non nova aut repentina res eſt, ut baptizandos cenſeamus eos qui ab hæreticis ad Eccleſiam veniunt; quando multi jam anni ſunt, & longa ætas, ex quo ſub Agrippino convenientes in unum Epiſcopi plurimi hoc ſtatuerint, atq; exinde in hodiernum diem tot millia hæreticorum, &c. Cyprian ep. 73.

De baptiſm. c. Donat. l. 4.

Agrippinus omnium mortalium primus contra Divinum Canonem, contra univerſalis Eccleſiæ regulam, contra ſenſum omnium conſacerdotum, contra morem atq; inſtituta majorum, baptizandos eos qui ab hæreticis ad Eccleſiam venirent, cenſuiſſe. Commonit. l. 1. cap. 9.

That long before that cuſtom obtained in Africa, *the ſame was practiſed and decreed in the moſt famous Churches both at* Iconium, Synada, *and other places.* On which account this great perſon profeſſeth, that he *durſt not condemn their Opinion who held ſo.* Whether this *Synod* at *Iconium* were the ſame with that mentioned by *Firmilian*, is not ſo certain, but, if it were, that can be no argument againſt the *Antiquity* of it. For, altho' *Firmilian* ſay,

Μὴ νῦν ὁι ἐν Αφρικῇ μόνον τοῦτο παρεισήγαγον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ πολλοῦ κατὰ τὰς πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπους ἐν ταῖς πολυανθρωποτάταις ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ταῖς Συνόδοις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν Ικονίῳ καὶ Συνάδοις, &c. Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 7. c. 7.

That we long ago, meeting in Iconium, *from* Galatia, Cilicia, *and the nighbour Regions have confirmed the ſame*, viz. *that Hereticks ſhould be baptized*; yet, as the learned *Valeſius* obſerves, the pronoun *We*, is not to be underſtood of *Firmilian*'s perſon, but of his *predeceſſors*; and therefore checks both *Baronius* and *Binius* for placing that *Synod*, A.D. 258. We ſee therefore this Opinion was ſo largely ſpread, that not only by the *Churches* in *Africa*, *Numidia*, and *Mauritania* favoured it, but almoſt all the *Eaſtern Chriſtians*. For *Dionyſius* in an Epiſtle to *Xyſtus*, who ſucceeded *Stephanus* at *Rome*, wherein he pleads for Moderation as to this Controverſie, and deſires him more throughly to conſider the weight of the buſineſs, and not proceed ſo raſhly as *Stephanus* had done; he tells him in concluſion, that he writ not this of himſelf, but at the requeſt of the ſeveral *Biſhops* of *Antioch*, *Cæſarea*, *Ælia*, *Tyre*, *Laodicea*, *Tarſus*, *&c.* Nay, and as it appears by *Firmilians* Epiſtle, they made no queſtion but this cuſtom of theirs deſcended from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*: For telling *Cyprian*, that in ſuch places where the other cuſtom had been uſed, they did well *to oppoſe truth to cuſtom*; *But we* (ſaith he) *joyn truth and cuſtom together, and to the cuſtom of the* Romans, *we oppoſe the cuſtom of truth, holding that from the beginning, which was delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* But therefore adds, *Neither do we remember when this practice began, ſeeing it was always obſerved among us.* And thence charges the *Church* of *Rome*, in that *Epiſtle*, with violating that, and ſeveral other *Traditions* of the *Apoſtles*. And *Vincentius Lirinenſis* ſtill takes *Stephens part*; and all that he hath to ſay, is, *That that is the property of Chriſtian modeſty and gravity, not to deliver their own Opinions to their poſterity, but to retain the Tradition of their Fore-fathers.* As tho' the other ſide could not ſay the ſame things, and with as much confidence as they did: but all the Queſtion was, What that *Tradition* was which they were to retain? The one ſaid one thing, and the other another. But, as *Rigaltius* well obſerves, *Vincentius ſpeaks very truly and prudently, if nothing were delivered, by our Anceſtors, but what they had from the Apoſtles*; *but, under the pretence of our Anceſtors, ſilly or counterfeit things may by fools or knaves be delivered us for Apoſtolical Traditions.* And whether this doth not often come to paſs, let the world judge. Now therefore, when theſe perſons on both ſides had incomparably greater advantages of knowing what the *Univerſal Apoſtolical practice* was than we can have, and yet ſo irreconcilably differ about it, what likelihood or probability is there, that we may have greater *certainty* of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, than of the *Writings*

Quod totum nos jam pridem in Iconii qui Phrygiæ locus eſt collecti in unum convenientibus ex Galatiâ & Ciliciâ, & cæteris proximis regionibus confirmavimus. Cypr. ep. 75.

Ubi pronomen Nos *non de ipſius Firmiliani perſonâ, ſed potius de ejus deceſſoribus accipiendum eſt.* Valeſ. not. in Euſeb. l. 7. c. 7.

Verum etiam omnes ferè (Eccleſiæ) quæ in Oriente magno numero Chriſtianam pietatem profitebantur. Rigalt. not. in Cypr. p. 145.

Cæterum nos veritati & conſuetudinem jungimus, & conſuetudini Romanorum, conſuetudinem ſed veritatis opponimus; ab initio hoc tenentes, quod à Chriſto & ab Apoſtolo traditum eſt. ep. 75. Cypr. p. 164. ed. Rigalt. V. etiam Baſil. ep. primâ Canon. ad Amphilochium. Tom. 2. p. 759.

Idq; eſſe proprium Chriſtianæ modeſtiæ & gravitatis, non ſua poſteris tradere, ſed à majoribus accepta ſervare. Ibid.

Quæ ſanè ſunt à Vincentio veriſſimè ac prudentiſſimè pronunciata, ſi non alia ſint à majoribus tradita, quàm quæ majores ab Apoſtolis ſuſceperant: Cæterum, ſub nomine ac perſonâ majorum, per fatuos aut Sophiſtas, aſinina aut Sophiſtica pro Apoſtolicis traderentur. Rigalt. obſerv. in Cydrian. p. 147.

of

of the *Apoſtles?* Eſpecially in ſuch matters as theſe are, in which it is very queſtionable, whether the *Apoſtles* had any occaſion miniſtred to them to determine any thing in them. And therefore when *Stephen* at *Rome*, and thoſe of his party pleaded cuſtom, and conſequently, as they thought *Apoſtolical Tradition*; it was not irrationally anſwered on the other ſide by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, that that might be, *Becauſe the Apoſtles had not occaſion given them to declare their minds in it*, becauſe either the Hereſies were not of ſuch a nature as thoſe of *Marcion* and *Cerdon*, or elſe there might not be ſuch returnings from thoſe *Hereſies* in the *Apoſtolical times* to the Church; which being of ſo black a nature, as to carry in them ſuch malignity, by corrupting the lives of Men by vicious practices, there was leſs probability either of the *true Chriſtians Apoſtatizing* into them, or the recovery of ſuch who were fallen into them. To this purpoſe *Firmilian* ſpeaks, *That the Apoſtles could not be ſuppoſed to prohibit the baptizing of ſuch which came from the Hereticks, becauſe no Man would be ſo ſilly, as to ſuppoſe the Apoſtles did prohibit that which came not in queſtion till afterwards.* And therefore S. *Auguſtine*, who concerned himſelf the moſt in this Controverſie, when he ſaw ſuch ill uſe made of it by the *Donatiſts* doth ingenuouſly confeſs, *That the Apoſtles did determine nothing at all in it*; *but however* (ſaith he) *that cuſtom which is oppoſed to* Cyprian, *is to be believed to have its riſe from the Apoſtles Tradition*; *as there are many other things obſerved in the Church, and on that account are believed to have been commanded by the Apoſtles although they are no where found written.* But, what cogent argument doth S. *Auſtin* uſe to perſwade them this was an *Apoſtolical Tradition?* He grants, they determined nothing in it, yet would needs have it believed, that an *Univerſal Practice* of *ſucceeding ages* ſhould imply ſuch a determination, tho' unwritten. But, 1. The *Univerſal Practice* we have, ſeen already, was far from being evident, when not only the *African*, but the *Eaſtern Church* did practiſe otherwiſe, and that on the account of an *Apoſtolical Tradition* too. 2. Suppoſing ſuch an *Univerſal Practice*, How doth it thence follow, that it muſt be derived from the *Apoſtles*; unleſs it be firſt prov'd, that the *Church* could never conſent in the *uſe* of any thing, but what the *Apoſtles* commanded them? Which is a very unreaſonable ſuppoſition, conſidering the different emergencies which might be in the *Churches* of *Apoſtolical* and ſucceeding times, and the different *reaſons* of *Practice* attending upon them, with that great deſire which crept into the *Church* of repreſenting the things conveyed by the Goſpel in an *external ſymbolical manner*, whence, in the ſecond *Century*, came the uſe of many *baptiſmal Ceremonies*, the *præguſtatio mellis & lactis*, as *Tertullian* calls it, and ſeveral of a like nature, which by degrees, came into the *Church:* Muſt we now derive theſe, and many other cuſtoms of the *Church* neceſſarily from the *Apoſtles*, when, even in S. *Auſtin's* time, ſeveral *cuſtoms* were ſuppoſed to be grounded on *Apoſtolical Tradition*, which yet are otherwiſe believed now? As in that known Inſtance of *Infants Participation* of the *Euchariſt*, which is otherwiſe determined by the *Council of Trent*; and, for all that I know, the arguments uſed againſt this Tradition by ſome Men, may as well hold againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*; for there is an equal incapacity as to the *exerciſe* of all *acts of reaſon* and *underſtanding* in both: and, as the *Scripture* ſeems to ſuppoſe ſuch *acts of grace* in one as have their foundation in the uſe

Cypr. ep. 74, 75.

Quantum ad id pertineat quod Stephanus dixit, quaſi Apoſtoli eos qui ab hæreſi veniant baptizari prohibuerint, & hoc cuſtodiendum poſteris tradiderint, pleniſſimè vos reſpondiſtis; Neminem tam ſtultum eſſe, qui hoc credat Apoſtolos tradidiſſe, quando etiam ipſas hæreſes conſtet execrabiles at deteſtandas poſtea extitiſſe. Firmil. ep. Cypr. 75.

Apoſtoli autem nihil quidem exinde præceperunt, ſed conſuetudo illa quæ opponebatur Cypriano, ab eorum traditione exordium ſumpſiſſe credenda eſt: ſicut ſunt multa quæ univerſa tenet Eccleſia, & ob hoc ab Apoſtolis præcepta benè creduntur, quamquam ſcripta non reperiantur. Aug. c. Donat. l. 5. c. 23.

uſe of *reaſon*, it doth likewiſe in the other, and I cannot ſee ſufficient evidence to the contrary; but if that place, *Except a Man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, taken in the ſenſe of the *Fathers*, doth imply a neceſſity of *Baptiſm* for all, and conſequently of *Children*; that other place, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, taken likewiſe in the ſenſe of the *Fathers*, will import the neceſſity of a *participation* of the *Euchariſt* by *Infants* as well as others. I ſpeak not this with an intention to plead either for *this*, or for the *rebaptizing Hereticks*, but to ſhew the great *uncertainty* of knowing *Apoſtolical Traditions*, ſome things having been taken for ſuch, which we believe were not ſo, and others which could not be known whether ſo or no, by the *ages* next ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*. And therefore let any reaſonable perſon judge what *probability* there is in what you drive at, that *Apoſtolical Traditions* may be more eaſily known than *Apoſtolical Writings*. John 3. 5. John 6. 5.

By which it appears, (3.) How vain and inſufficient your reaſons are, §. 5. *Why Traditions ſhould not be ſo liable to corruption as the Scriptures.* 1. You ſay, *Univerſal Traditions are recorded in Authors of every ſucceeding age: and it ſeems more incident to have the Bible corrupted than them, becauſe of its bulk and paſſing through the hands of particular Men; whereas univerſal and immemorial Traditions are openly practiſed and taken notice of by every one in all ages.* To which I anſwer, 1. That you give no ſufficient *reaſon* why the *Bible* ſhould be corrupted. 2. And as little why *Tradition* ſhould be more preſerved than that. Two Accounts you give why the Bible might be corrupted by errors, *becauſe of its bulk, and paſſing through the hands of particular Men.* But do you think it impoſſible, or at leaſt unreaſonable, to ſuppoſe that a Book of no greater *bulk* than the *Bible*, ſhould, by the care and vigilancy of Men, through the aſſiſtance of *Divine Providence*, be preſerved from any material *corruptions* or *alterations?* Surely, if you think ſo, you have mean thoughts of the *Chriſtians* in all ages, and meaner of *Divine Providence:* For, you muſt ſuppoſe *God* to take no care at all for the preſervation of a Monument of unſpeakable concernment to the good of mankind; and you muſt conceive the *Chriſtians*, in all *ages*, to be ſtupendiouſly *careleſs* and *negligent*, either in tranſcribing, or reading the *Scriptures*, which could ſuffer errors to ſlip into them, without diſcovery of them. Do you think that the *Chriſtians* had no higher eſteem of the *Scriptures*, than of the *Uſe* of *Altars*. or any other of your immemorial *Traditions?* But, ſay you, *The one were publick, and the other paſſed through the hands of particular Men.* It ſhould ſeem then, their *Altars* were upon *high places*, but the *Scriptures* were only read in *corners*, never any ſuch thing being publickly read as the *Bible*, ſo that any alteration might be there, and no notice at all taken of it. The poor *African Biſhop* found the contrary to his ſorrow, who was in ſuch danger from the people, for altering but one word according to S. *Hierom*'s Tranſlation, as S. *Auſtine* reports the ſtory. But, ſuppoſe *it paſſed through the hands of particular Men*, Was it therefore more liable to be corrupted? I ſhould think juſt the contrary; unleſs you could ſuppoſe all thoſe *particular Men* to agree in *corrupting* it, which, conſidering the difference of *opinions*, *capacities*, and *intereſts*, is a moſt unreaſonable ſuppoſition; that ſome *verbal* and *literal miſtakes* might ſlip in, you might rationally imagine, but that therefore any great *corruptions* ſhould creep into it, argues your mean thoughts both of *Gods Providence*, and the care of the *Chriſtian world*. Well, *but ſtill it is impoſſible to corrupt your Traditions.* It were a much harder matter to free your *Traditions* from being *corruptions* themſelves of the *purity* of the *Chriſtian Church*. And why ſo hard for them to be corrupted? *Be-*

cauſe recorded in Authours of every ſucceeding age. I had thought, all Books of *equal*, or much bigger bulk than the *Scripture*, had been as liable to *corruption* as *that*; but it ſeems not. If a *Book* be written of *Traditions*, the very *Traditions* will preſerve it *pure*, tho' as big as that *Livy*, *Quem mea vix totum bibliotheca capit*, but that is not all, it ſeems theſe *Traditions are recorded in Authors of every ſucceeding age:* Unhappy Men we that cannot find them there! I wiſh, inſtead of writing *Controverſies*, you would write the *hiſtory* of theſe *Traditions*; but, be ſure to deduce them through the *Authors* of every *ſucceeding age*; and, I ſuppoſe, you mean, ever ſince the *Apoſtles*. I ſhall then indeed believe *Popiſh Traditions* to be no *Novelties*, but not before. But, let us grant this: Were not the *Scriptures* atteſted by the ſame Authors? No, *It ſeems, they were agreed about all Traditions, but not ſo about the Scriptures.* And the reaſon is, *Becauſe the Scriptures were firſt delivered to private Men, as S.* John's *Epiſtle, and S.* Luke's *Goſpel*; *but Traditions had an univerſal practice.* But, Can you ſuppoſe it otherwiſe, but that particular Books muſt be firſt delivered to private Men? Would you have them delivered only to *General Councils*, or the *Pope* and his *Cardinals?* It ſeems S. *John* was to blame for not directing his Epiſtle to the *Pope*, inſtead of *Gaius*; and S. *Luke* his Goſpel to a *General Council*, inſtead of *Theophilus*; for then we might have had *Infallible Certainty* of them; but now it is a plain *caſe*, we can have no more than *Moral Certainty* that ever they were theirs. But, for this trick, it ſeems, they fared the worſe; *for ſome Books were doubted of, for many years, in particular Churches.* It is well yet, they were not diſcarded by your *Catholick Church*, becauſe the *Apoſtles* did not put their *Books* into your *hands* to recommend them. But what if ſome *Books*, by ſome *Men*, were for ſome time doubted of, which yet were afterwards univerſally received upon ſufficient evidence? *Why then* (ſay you) *Tradition hath much advantage of Scripture.* How ſo? Was no Tradition, which would be accounted *univerſal*, doubted of by any Men at any time? *No* (ſay you) *it is impoſſible it ſhould, for univerſal Traditions were univerſally practiſed at all times.* Now you ſpeak home; and nothing wants to the proof of it, but only to let us know, What theſe *Univerſal Traditions* are, which were ſo univerſally practiſed in all ages, containing things different from *Scripture*, which are recorded in the *Authors* of every ſucceeding Age. Your offer is ſo fair, that my requeſt ſhall be very ſhort; *name them*, and *prove them*, and I will believe you, but not before. So much for this, which, tho a *digreſſion* in this *Chapter*, yet is not from the *deſign* of this *diſcourſe*.

§. 6. Setting aſide therefore your diſcourſe about A. C's *Pen being troubled*, in which is nothing worth our notice; I come to the main diſpute of this Chapter, which is, *Whether the Promiſes of Infallibility made to the Apoſtles, are to be reſtrained to their own times, or to be extended to the preſent Church in all ages?* We aſſert the former, and you the later. For which you produce this Argument, *That from theſe very places, Chriſtians do in-*

P. 99. n. 3. *fer, that the Church ſhall never fall away and periſh. For if the aſſiſtance be not to preſerve the ſucceeding Church, at leaſt from ſome kind of errours infallibly; it may notwithſtanding all the aſſiſtance he allows it here, fall into all kind of errors one after another, and ſo by degrees, the whole Church might fall into a general Apoſtaſie, and thereby periſh. There muſt therefore be ſome kind of infallible aſſiſtance in the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, by virtue of theſe Promiſes.* But, 1, Is it all one to ſay, There ſhall always be a *Church*, and to ſay; That *Church* ſhall always be *infallible?* Thoſe, who from the places in queſtion,

queſtion, do prove, that the *Church* ſhall never quite *fall away*, do not dream of a *preſent Infallibility* in your ſenſe, but that there always ſhall be a number of Men profeſſing *Chriſtianity* in the World: And, Cannot you poſſibly conceive, that there ſhould be ſuch a number of Men profeſſing *Chriſtianity* without *Infallibility?* To help therefore your underſtanding a little; ſuppoſe that all the Members of the *Roman Church* ſhould in one *Age* be deſtroyed (and, according to your former Principle, that *if a Church may err, we cannot be certain but that it doth err*; becauſe this may be, we cannot be certain but that it is) but we only make the ſuppoſition: Do not you think that there would be ſtill a number remaining, who profeſs *Chriſtianity*, of the *Greek* and *Proteſtant Churches?* Yet, I hope, you will not ſay, that theſe were *Infallible*. There may be then a number of *Chriſtians*, who are not *Infallible*; and that is all which is meant by ſaying, *That the preſent Church is Infallible in Fundamentals*, *viz.* that there ſhall always be a *Church*, for that which makes them a *Church*, is the belief of *Fundamentals*; and if they believe not them, they ceaſe to be ſo. That therefore which being ſuppoſed, a *Church* is, and being deſtroyed, it ceaſeth to be, is the formal *conſtitution* of it; but thus it is as to the *Church*, the belief of *Fundamentals* makes it a *Church*, and the not belief of them makes them ceaſe to be a *Chriſtian Church*; I ſpeak of an *Eſſential* and not of an *Organical Church*; and, I know not who thoſe Perſons are, who, out of thoſe places, do infer the perpetuity of an *Organical Church*; nor, if they did, doth it thence follow, they muſt ſuppoſe an *Infallible Aſſiſtance*, beyond an *Eſſential* to make it an *Organical Church*. For I cannot imagine what neceſſity can be ſuppoſed of *Infallibility*, in order to that which may be ſufficiently conſtituted without it. 2. I anſwer, the perpetuity of the *Church* doth rather argue the *Infallibility* of the *Promiſe* than of the *Church*. Which if you did conſider, you would not certainly infer *Infallibility* from a *Promiſe* of *Perpetuity*. For all the *Infallibility* ſuppoſable in this caſe is an *Infallibility* of *Accompliſhment* of the *Promiſe* made. As in a clear and parallel Inſtance of that *Promiſe*, *The Scepter ſhall not depart from* Judah, *nor a Lawgiver from between his feet*, *until* Shiloh *come*. Taking it in the moſt received Interpretation among *Chriſtians*, that the *Jewiſh Polity* ſhould remain till the days of the *Meſſias*; doth this infer, that there ſhould be a continual *Infallibility* in the *Jewiſh Polity*, becauſe there was a *Promiſe* made of its *Perpetuity?* When *God* ſaith, *In* Jeruſalem *have I ſet my name for ever*, doth it follow that *Jeruſalem* ſhould be always *Infallible?* But how would you triumph beyond all reaſon, if you had but any thing like ſuch a promiſe for *Rome*, as that is for *Jeruſalem?* Suppoſing then that the *Promiſes* by you inſiſted on, ſhould be ſo far extended, as to imply a *perpetuity* of a *Chriſtian Church*, what doth that argue, but only this, that to make it appear that *Promiſe* is infallibly true, there ſhall always be a ſucceſſion of *Chriſtians* in the World? 3. Suppoſe I ſhould grant that the *Being* of a *Chriſtian Church* doth ſuppoſe the *aſſiſtance* of *God's Spirit*, is there no *aſſiſtance* but what is *Infallible?* If not, no one can be a *Chriſtian* without *Infallibility*; For we ſpeak of no other *aſſiſtance*, but what is neceſſary to make Men *Chriſtians*; for, what makes them ſuch ſeverally, take them conjunctly makes them a *Church*. But if you, beſides what *aſſiſtance* is requiſite to make them *Chriſtians*, do ſuppoſe ſomewhat more to make them a *Church*, I pray name *what it is*; and whatever it be, it will not be owned by *ſuch* who infer a perpetuity of a *Church* out of theſe places. But if in order to that no more be meant, (as no more can be meant) than what

Gen. 49. 10.

is neceſſary to make Men *Chriſtians*, then *Infallibility* will grow ſo cheap and common, it will not be worth challenging by you for your *Church*. 4. Suppoſe I grant this Aſſiſtance to be *Infallible*, doth all *Infallible Aſſiſtance* make an *Infallible Teſtimony?* I am ſure not in their ſenſe, who ſay the *Church is Infallible in Fundamentals*, for they never offer to aſſert that the preſent *Church is Infallible* in defining what are *Fundamentals*, and what not. And this is the only *Infallibility* in queſtion, *viz.* Such a one as makes the Teſtimony of thoſe who have it *Infallible*. For ſuch a kind of *aſſiſtance* was that of the *Apoſtles*, which is only the thing enquired after. If you can therefore prove ſuch an *Infallibility* in your *Churches* Teſtimony, as the *Apoſtles* had, you do ſomething; but what is ſhort of this, is nothing at all to the purpoſe. 5. Suppoſe I ſhould grant the Teſtimony of the *Catholick Church* to be *Infallible*, yet all the Conceſſions were nothing for your advantage, unleſs you could as evidently prove that your *Church* is the only *Catholick Church*. Which that you can never do, will appear when we come to that Queſtion. 6. Suppoſe I ſhould yield the *Catholick Churches Teſtimony* to be *Infallible*, and your *Church* to be the *Catholick Church*; yet all this is far from proving *Pope*, or *Council*, or both to be *Infallible*. For, By what means come they to claim the *Infallibility* as belonging to them which is given to the *Church?* By what deeds are the *conveyances* ſettled of the *Priviledges* of the *Church* to them? Where is it ever ſaid in *Scripture*, or in the leaſt intimated, that the *Promiſes* made to the *Church* are to be underſtood of the *repreſentative Church?* The *Apoſtles* had this Promiſe in their perſonal *Capacities* made to them, and not in a *repreſentative*; how comes then the Promiſe to be underſtood of a *repreſentation* afterwards? Thus you ſee, that you are at leaſt *ſix removes* from any *title* to claim this *Infallibility* from theſe *Promiſes* by: And therefore you have little hopes that your *claim* ſhould be admitted upon ſo ſlender a *Title*.

§. 7. From this therefore at preſent you fly off, to the vindicating *A. C. from aſſerting Infallibility belonging to all the Doctors and Paſtors of the Church*; which yet is a very good deſign to vindicate a Man from his own words. For are they not as expreſs as may be, viz. *That there is the Promiſe of Chriſt, and his Holy Spirits continual preſence*, Luke 10. 16. Matth. 28. 19, 20. John 14. 16. *not only to the Apoſtles, but to their Succeſſors alſo, the lawfully ſent Paſtors and Doctors of the Church in all Ages?* To which his Lordſhip ſaith, *Here's a deal of Infallibility indeed, and yet error ſtore.* You preſently cry out, *But what ſhall we ſay to an Adverſary that forges what Chimerical Doctrine he pleaſes, and then fights againſt it?* What *Chimerical Doctrine* is that which he forges? Doth he not relate *A. C.*'s *words?* And do you, or can you, deny them to be his words? But, ſay you, *This was not his meaning.* I ſuppoſe you mean, *That his words as they are, are not defenſible*, and therefore you muſt have a σοφὸν φάρμακον for them: Which is, *That he did not underſtand theſe words of every Doctor apart, but of Paſtors and Doctors lawfully aſſembled in Oecumenical Councils.* But, 1. Are *Paſtors* and *Doctors* never *lawfully* ſent, but when they are in *Oecumenical Councils?* For it is plain *A. C.* ſpeaks of them as *lawfully ſent.* 2. Have *Paſtors* and *Doctors* met in *Oecumenical Councils in all Ages?* I would you could prove a truly *Oecumenical Council* in any Age; but ſure you never pretend to it *in all Ages*, yet if *A. C.*'s words have any *ſenſe* in them, they ſpeak of ſuch an Infallibility, as belongs to the *Church in all Ages*. And therefore this Plaiſter is a great deal too narrow to cover the Sore. But, ſay you, *Every Author is to be underſtood to mean by his words, what they will properly bear; and is conſonant with the meaning of his other words.* I

p. 94. p. 99.

moſt

most freely grant you this and all that follows, if you will prove it impossible for any Man to speak *non-sense*, or *contradictions*; But I can more easily prove it very possible for a Man to speak things which *contradict* one the other, which I have sufficiently proved from your own *dear self* in this very Discourse of *Infallibility*. What follows concerning the *Jesuits pretence of Infallibility to themselves* (proved by his Lordship, *from the words of the Apologist, to whom* Casaubon *replies in his Epistle to* Fronto Ducæus, which are these, *Let day and night —— life and death be joyned together, and then there will be some hope that Heresie may fall upon the Person of a Jesuite*) is very well worth the observing, were it only for that rare and incomparable answer, which you make to them. In which, it is hard to guess whether your ingenuity or your wit surpass the other. *Rabbi Casaubon*, κακοῦ κόρακος κακὸν ᾠὸν, *must help him out. An Apologist, saith* Casaubon, *avers, 'tis impossible for a Jesuite to err. Who is this Anonymus Apologist? A Jesuite or a Minister? For an Apologist and a Jesuite, are no more convertible terms, than a Jesuite, or a Minister. How shall we know then, whether this nameless Apologist was a Jesuite, or a Minister personating a Jesuite? The Gospel will tell us: Ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos.* O rare Drollery! doth this pass for Wit at *Rome?* Or must we think you speak these words in good earnest? If so, your *Ignorance* is more than ordinary in these matters. For to pass by your unworthy reflection on that excellent Person *Isaac Casaubon*, whose memory is as far above your detraction, as his *Learning* beyond your *reach*; and, to let go your scurrilous *Greek Proverb*, κακοῦ κόρακος κακὸν ᾠὸν (which some will tell you was *Greek* for a *Jesuite*) are you really so *ignorant*, that you did not know whether the *Apologist*, whose words are cited, were a *Jesuite* or a *Minister?* What not he, who professedly undertakes the *Vindication* of the *Jesuites?* Not he, who was so seriously recommended by *Fronto Ducæus* a *Jesuite* himself? Not he, who industriously vindicates *Ribadeneira, Scribanius, Emanuel Sa, Bellarmine*, and others, in their Doctrine which doth most reflect on the *Power* and *Authority* of *Princes?* Not he, who extols *Father Garnet* who was executed in *England* for the *Gunpowder-Treason*, yet for all this not he known to be a *Jesuite?* Are you yet to seek? Apply but your own rule of the *Gospel* to what is said already, and *by those Fruits* you cannot but know him to be a *Jesuite*.

p. 100.

But now, notwithstanding the sufficient answers which have been so often given to the places produced for the *proof* of the *Churches Infallibility* out of *Scripture*, you thought it no needless trouble in *A. C.* to mention them, and much less in your self to vindicate them from the *Bishops interpretation*: The places are *Luke* 10. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me*, Matth. 28. 20. *I am with you always to the end of the world*, John 14. 16. *The Comforter the Holy Ghost shall abide with you for ever.* That which you would infer from these places, is, *That an Infallible Assistance is promised to the Church in all Ages, not in its diffusive sense but representative*, viz. *in the Pastors and Doctors assembled in Council.* The substance of his Lordship's answer to these places, is in these words; *These promises were made of continual presence and assistance, that I grant; and they were made to the Apostles and their Successors, that I grant too, but in a different degree. For it was of continual and Infallible assistance to the Apostles, but to their Successors of continual and fitting assistance, but not Infallible.* To this you return no answer in general, but endeavour to evince the contrary from the particular places, by disproving his *Interpretations* of them. To the first therefore, *Luke* 10. 16. *He that heareth you heareth me*, &c. His Lordship answers, *That this was absolutely true in*

§. 8.

P. 93. n. 28.

in the Apoſtles, who kept themſelves to that which was revealed by Chriſt; but it was to be but conditionally true in their Succeſſors, i. e. *ſo long and ſo far as you ſpeak my words and not your own. For where the command is for* Matth. 28. 20. *Preaching, the Reſtraint is added. Go, ſaith Chriſt, and teach all Nations: But you may not Preach all things that you pleaſe, but all things which I have* P. 101. *commanded you. The Publication is yours, the Doctrine is mine; and where the Doctrine is not mine, there your Publication is beyond, or ſhort of your Commiſſion.* To this you reply, *That this is rather to pervert our Saviour's words, than to interpret them, is manifeſt.* And the reaſon you give, is, *Becauſe a Sectary, who denies the Apoſtles Infallibility as well as the Churches, might apply this reſtraint to the Apoſtles themſelves, as well as he now applies it to their Succeſſors.* But they are ſtrange kind of *Sectaries* indeed who deny the *Apoſtles Infallibility*, and my memory doth not ſerve me with any ſuch who aſſerted *Chriſt's Infallibility* and denied the *Apoſtles*; but if there be any ſuch *Sectaries*, let us know them, that we may then ſay, There are ſome in the World who believe great *abſurdities* as well as you. However let us for the preſent, take this for a *ſuppoſition*, that any Men might do ſo; whether then they might not ſay, the *Apoſtles* were only *Infallible* when they ſpake *Chriſt's words* and not their own, *i.e.* delivered his Doctrine and not any other. No doubt they might, and ſaid very well in it too. And if theſe be the *Sectaries* you mean, I am one of them my ſelf; For I believe, the *Apoſtles* were no further *Infallible* than as they delivered *Chriſt's Doctrine* to the World, and I ſuppoſe there are many ſuch *Sectaries* beſides my ſelf. But all the difference then between the *Apoſtles* and their *Succeſſors* was this, that thoſe who heard the *Apoſtles Doctrine* had ground to believe them *Infallible* in what they delivered for *Chriſt's Doctrine*; but we have no ground to believe ſo of any *Church* ſince the *Apoſtles* times, that it is *Infallible* in delivering the *Doctrine of Chriſt* to others. The promiſe then of *Infallible Aſſiſtance* as made to the *Apoſtles*, doth imply that *God's Spirit* would be ſo with them, that they ſhould deliver nothing for the revealed Will of *God* or the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*, but what was really and truly ſo. And if you can from this or any other place prove ſuch an *Infallible Aſſiſtance* to the *Church* of all *Ages*, you do ſomething, but not otherwiſe. But for this particular place, *He that heareth you heareth me*; I have ſomething more yet to ſay, which may manifeſt how wholly impertinent it is to your purpoſe. 1. It ſeems to me very queſtionable, whether any ſuch thing as *Infallibility* be at all implied in this place: And then certainly from hence you cannot infer a ſucceſſive *Infallibility* in the *Church*. And the reaſons why I queſtion it, are, 1. The *Apoſtles* themſelves had not that continual *Infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Spirit of God* till after *Chriſt's Aſcenſion*, when the promiſe of *Chriſt's* ſending his *Spirit* upon them was remarkably accompliſhed, Will you ſay then they had *Infallible Aſſiſtance* by the *Spirit*, before the promiſe of that *Infallible Aſſiſtance* was made to them? If then the *Apoſtles* themſelves had not ſuch a continual *Infallible Aſſiſtance*, much leſs the *LXX* Diſciples who are here ſpoken of. 2. The *meſſage* they were ſent upon did not at all require any *Infallible Aſſiſtance*, for it was only a *preparative meſſage*, they not being ſent to deliver fully the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, but to tell them, *The Kingdom of God is at hand, or nigh unto you.* Verſe 9, 11. *i. e.* that bleſſed ſtate of things under the *Meſſias* is now ready to be revealed to you: The whole deſign therefore of that Commiſſion of the *LXX* Diſciples and the *Apoſtles*, when they were firſt ſent abroad, was of the ſame nature with *John Baptiſts*, *viz.* to prepare People for the reception and entertainment of that *Doctrine* which *Chriſt* ſhould deliver to them.

them. Now what *Infallible assistance* can be supposed necessary in order to this? 3. The words imply nothing of *Infallible assistance* in them. For when *Christ* saith, *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me:* the plain meaning is no more than this, They which hearken to your message, and believe the *truth* of what you say, do therein manifest their *readiness* to hearken to me, and consequently will receive my *Doctrine*, when it is delivered to them; but they who despise this message of yours, the *affront* they offer you, reflects most on me who *sent* you; and they shall find to their sorrow, that in *rejecting me* they reject *God* too, who will punish them severely for it: which, that it is the meaning of the words, will very easily appear to any one that considers the scope and design of the place. Now is it not possible for any to declare their respect to *Christ* by receiving his *Messengers* without believing those *Messengers* to be *Infallible?* If that be possible, then what kind of *Infallibility* can you hence infer? 2. Suppose I should grant these *LXX. Infallible* in what they delivered, yet nothing can be hence drawn for the *Churches continual Infallibility*, because of the different reason of one from the other, and that will appear in these things. 1. These were immediately sent abroad by *Christ* himself, when there were no *Infallible writings* containing this *Doctrine*, made by himself or his *Apostles*. And was there not then much more reason for such an *Infallibility*, than there can be now? 2. These had sufficient *evidences* to attest that *Infallibility*, by that power of *Miracles*, which they had in curing diseases and casting out of *Devils*, *vers.* 9, —— 17. And therefore those they were sent to had sufficient inducement to believe such an *Infallibility*, if they had pretended to it; when therefore you can prove the like of your *lawfully sent Doctors and Pastors*, either apart or in a *General Council*, you may then from hence argue something towards that *Infallibility*, but not before.

In your following words you acknowledge a difference in applying this Text to the *Apostles* and *their Successors*, *For it was true in every one of the Apostles apart, but it is not so in every one of these succeeding Pastors*; and for this you give these Reasons, 1. *Your adversaries and you are agreed in it*, viz. *That the Pastors apart are fallible.* 2. *'Tis manifest by experience, that many eminent Pastors have not only been erroneous, but heretical.* 3. *There is universal Tradition for it.* 4. *Plain Scripture for it, that even from themselves there should arise some that should speak perverse things.* These reasons I acknowledge to be so true, that, if you had expressed the *Pope* himself in them, you could not have proved his fallibility better, than by *Experience*, *Consent*, and *Scripture*. But yet you have two Reserves in a Corner, which mar all the rest, *viz.* that from these places you make *General Councils infallible*, and, according to your most received persuasion, the *Pope* too. Do you so indeed? and from these places? and both of them Infallible, whether they agree or not? But if our reasons be not stronger against any such *Infallibility* deducible from these places, than yours are for it (for I have not seen any) I am content to blind my understanding so much, if I can, P. 102. as to believe what you say, *That to give reasons against your exposition is impossible.* But as your reason in all other things is weak, so in this it appears, that either your *ignorance* or your *confidence* is intolerable.

The next place, is, Matth. 28. 20. *I am with you always, even unto the* §. 9. *end of the world.* To which his Lordship saith, *Yes most certain it is, present by his spirit; for else in bodily presence, he continued not with his Apostles but during his abode on earth. And this promise of his spiritual presence was* P. 96.

to

their Succeſſors; elſe why to the end of the world? The Apoſtles did not, could not live ſo long; But then to the Succeſſors, the Promiſe goes no further than, I am with you always, which reaches to continual aſſiſtance, but not to Divine and Infallible. What ſay you now to this? Why forſooth, *It is the ſame anſwer as before, and therefore deſerves no further refutation.* But doth it not deſerve ſome further proof of your Infallibility from this place? Or are you content to let it go, becauſe you cannot but ſee, that a *ſpiritual preſence* and not *infallible* is hereby promiſed, either to the *Apoſtles* or their *Succeſſors*, although from other places it appears, that the *ſpiritual preſence* of *Chriſt* with his *Apoſtles* did extend to ſo high a degree, as to make them *infallible* in what they delivered for the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, but no place of *Scripture* doth aſſert ſo much of the *Churches Infallibility*. It is well then that you grant, that St. *Gregory* did not believe any *infallible aſſiſtance* in the *Paſtors of the Church*; but (you ſay) *he underſtood it of them apart*, to make which probable, you muſt produce ſome other places, where he ſaith otherwiſe of them in *Council*. But how a gracious *preſence of Chriſt* with his *Church*, which you grant *Rhabanus Maurus* meant by this place, ſhould ſuppoſe a *conjunctive infallibility* of the *Paſtors* as a neceſſary foundation and ſupport of the *Church diffuſive*, I confeſs is beyond my underſtanding, but at leaſt you ſay, *it denies it not:* neither doth it deny that you or I are infallible; but doth it therefore follow that we are ſo? What places you produce (or rather bid us go ſeek for out of the Fathers) *to prove that they, in effect,* (it ſeems then, not evidently) *do attribute infallibility to the Church* (but by no means *Divine infallibility*, for this is more than the third time that you have forbid the *Banes* between thoſe two words *Divine* and *Infallible*) will to any that reads them appear to be capable of proving no more than the *Perpetuity of a Church* in the world; but if any of them can do any better ſervice, I doubt not, but we ſhall again meet with them, and therefore ſhall adjourn their conſideration to a more convenient place. *To prove that any of the Fathers have denied this place to extend to infallibility,* is a very unreaſonable thing, which you put *the Biſhop and his party upon*, becauſe they only deliver what they conceive the meaning of places to be, without reflections on any *Hereſies*, but ſuch as were moſt prevalent in their own times. And if your Church had in their time callenged *Infallibility* from ſuch places, you might have heard of their *Negative*, which at preſent you put us unreaſonably to prove.

§. 10. Your anſwer to *John* 14. 16. only is, *that it muſt be underſtood in ſome abſolute ſenſe*; and doth not his Lordſhip ſay ſo too, *viz. in regard of Conſolation and Grace.* But if you ſay, there can be no other *abſolute* ſenſe, but an *infallible aſſiſtance*, you would do well to prove it, and not barely to ſuppoſe it: and ſo likewiſe, what follows as to *John* 16. 13. (which his Lordſhip juſtly reſtrains to the *Apoſtles* alone) you tell us, *That you contend, that in whatſoever ſenſe all truth is to be underſtood in reſpect of each Apoſtle apart, it is alſo to be underſtood in relation to their Succeſſors, aſſembled in a full Repreſentative of the whole Church. That you contend*, we grant; but we ſay, it is without ſenſe or reaſon. And therefore come to examine
P. 103. n 5. what you produce for it. Your firſt reaſon, *Becauſe the Repreſentative of the Church in General Council, and the Biſhop of* Rome *as Paſtor of the whole Church, have equal power to oblige the Church to believe what they deliver, as each Apoſtle had*, is utterly denied, and muſt be more than barely ſuppoſed as it is here. Your ſecond, which you call *the Fundamental reaſon* of this
N. 6. *Expoſition* is, in ſhort, *That the preſervation of the Church requires infallibility*

in

in future Ages of the Church, as well as in the Apoſtles times, which is again utterly denied; and the next time you write, I pray prove your reaſons well; and think not your confident producing things you know are denied by us, will ſerve for reaſons againſt us. Before you can ſufficiently prove that any rite of the *Church*, not mentioned in *Scripture*, had the *Holy Ghoſt* for its Author, eſpecially when contrary to a cuſtom expreſſed in *Scripture*, you muſt do more than produce a ſingle teſtimony of St. *Auguſtine* for it; who was apt to ſuppoſe the *Holy Ghoſt* might be pleaſed with ſuch things, which the *Church*, though not therein infallible, might conſent in the practice of. Which certainly is far from ſuppoſing the *Church* to have infallible aſſiſtance with it, in delivering Doctrines of Faith; becauſe ſome things might be uſed in the *Church* which the *Holy Ghoſt* might be ſuppoſed not diſpleaſed with, which is the utmoſt can be made of your Citation out of St. *Auſtin*.

It ſeems you were aware of that diſparity between the *Apoſtles* times and ours, as to the pretence of *Infallibility*, becauſe the *Apoſtles* were firſt to deliver this Doctrine to the World, and after to conſign it by writing to future Ages; from whence it were eaſie to infer, there could not be that neceſſity of a *continual Infallible Aſſiſtance* in the *Church*, becauſe the Doctrine infallibly delivered by them is preſerved in the *Church* by the *Infallible Records of it*. But to this your anſwer is conſiderable. *What wiſe Man* (ſay you) *would go about to raiſe a ſtately Building for many Ages, and ſatisfie himſelf with laying a Foundation to laſt but for a few years? Our Saviour the wiſeſt of Architects, is not to be thought to have founded this incomparable Building of the Church upon Sand; which muſt infallibly have happened, had he not intended to afford his continual aſſiſtance alſo to the ſucceeding Paſtors of the Church, to lead them, when aſſembled in a general Council, into all thoſe truths wherein he firſt ſettled the Apoſtles.* Whether you call this arguing for the *Churches Infallibility*, or libelling againſt our *Bleſſed Saviour* if he hath not done what you would have him, is hard to determine. I am ſure, it is arguing *ab abſurdo* with a witneſs; for if he hath not done, juſt as you fancy he ſhould have done; he muſt venture to be accounted an *Ignoramus* and *Impoſtor* before, and here *to do that which no wiſe Man would have done*, viz. *build a ſtately Fabrick, the Church, upon the Sands*. So it ſeems you account *the Prophets and the Apoſtles*: For if the *Apoſtle* may be credited, *we are built on the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-ſtone*. And this is it you muſt mean *by being built on the Sand*; for herein it is plain, the *Church* is built on theſe, *viz.* that *Infallible Doctrine* which was delivered *by them*, but here is not one word, or the leaſt intimation of an *inherent Infallibility* in the *Church* which was to be its foundation ſo as to ſecure it from all error. *And this* (ſay you) *muſt infallibly happen, if there be not the ſame Infallibility in General Councils which was in the Apoſtles*; for that I ſuppoſe muſt be the meaning of your laſt words, if they be to the purpoſe. But how groundleſs your pretence of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils* is, will appear when we come to that Subject; but have you ſo little of common ſenſe and reaſon with you, as to ſuppoſe the *Church* preſently, notwithſtanding the *Divine Revelation* of the *Doctrine of Chriſtianity* in *Scripture* to be built on Sand, if *General Councils be not Infallible?* Is there not ſufficient ground to rely on the Doctrine of *Chriſtianity*, ſuppoſing there never had been any *General Council* in the World? What was the *Church* built on before the *Nicene Council*, only on *Sand?* Surely the *Wind* and *Billows* of Perſecutions would then have eaſily overturned it. What if

P. 104. D. 7.

Eph. 2. 20.

through civil combustions in the *Empire* there could never have been any *Assemblies* of the *Bishops* afterwards, must the *Church* needs have fallen to the ground for want of *General Councils?* But why, I pray, must the *Infallibility* of the *Apostles* be compared only *to a foundation that can last but for few years?* Do you suppose that these *Apostles* never did commit their *Doctrine Infallibly* to *Writing*; or that these *Writings* of theirs did last but for *a few years?* Without one of these, it is hard to find out your meaning by those expressions. If you deny either of them, I shall readily prove them: But if you affirm both these (as if you are heartily a *Christian* you must do) with what face can you say that *Christ*, in making the *Apostles* infallible, did lay a *Foundation* but for a few years. But thanks be to *God*, although perverse and unreasonable Men are always quarelling with the methods of *Divine Wisdom* and *Goodness*, this *Foundation of the Lord standeth sure still*; and, as long as the *Infallible Doctrine of the Gospel* continues, the *Church* will be built on a stedfast and unmoveable *Rock*, which will prove a much surer *Foundation* than the *seven Hills* of *Infallibility*. But this is your grand and fundamental Mistake, to suppose a *Church* cannot continue without a *vital inherent Principle* of *Infallibility* in her self, which must be discovered by *Infallible* Directions from the *Head* of it: Whereas we grant the necessity of an *Infallible Foundation* of Faith, but cannot discern either from *Scripture*, *Reason*, or *Antiquity*, that there must be a living and standing *Infallible Judge*, which must deliver and interpret those Infallible Records to us. We grant then Infallibility in the *Foundation* of Faith, we assert the highest *Certainty* of the *Infallibility* of that *Foundation*, we declare that the owning of that *Infallible Foundation* is that which makes Men *Christians* (the Body of whom we call a *Church*) we further grant, that *Christ* hath left in his *Church* sufficient *means* for the preservation of it in Truth and Unity; but we deny that ever he promised such an *Infallibility* to be constantly resident in that *Church*, as was in the *Prophets* and *Apostles*; and that neither any intention of Christ, or any reason in the thing can be manifested, why such an *Infallibility* should be so necessary for the *Churches Preservation*, that without it the *Wisdom of Christ* must be questioned, and the *Church* built on a Sandy Foundation. Your Citation of *Vincentius Lirinensis* proves nothing but the *Churches* constancy in adhering to that Doctrine of Faith, which was delivered from the beginning; but how that should prove a *constant Infallibility*, I cannot understand, unless it is impossible that there should be any *Truth*, where there is no inherent *Infallibility*. Thus we see, what very little success you have in the attempt of proving the *Churches* continual *Infallibility* from *Scripture*.

§. 11. From hence you proceed to the consideration of the way, How *Scripture* and *Tradition* do mutually confirm each other. His Lordship grants, *That*
P. 98. n. 31. *they do mutually, but not equally, confirm the Authority either of other. For Scripture doth infallibly confirm the authority of Church-Traditions, truly so called: But Tradition doth but morally and probably confirm the authority of the*
P. 105. *Scripture. This* (say you) *is apparently false*, but endeavour not to make it evident, that it is so: Only you say, *A. C. refused already to grant it. Et quid tum postea?* Must every thing be false which *A. C.* refuses to grant? But let us see, whether his *Similitude* makes it out. *For* (saith he) *'Tis as a King's Embassadours word of mouth, and his King's Letters bear mutual witness to each other. Just so indeed* (saith his Lordship) *For his King's Letters of Credence under Hand and Seal, confirm the Embassadours authority infallibly to all that know his Seal and Hand: But the Embassadours word of mouth confirms his King's Letters, but only probably. For else, Why are they call'd Letters of Credence,*

Credence, if they give not him more credit, than he gives them? To which you make a large reply. 1. *That the King's Hand and Seal cannot confirm infallibly to a Foreign King, who neither knows hand nor Seal, the Embaſſadours Authority; and therefore this reacheth not the buſineſs, How we ſhould know infallibly, that the Scripture is God's Word.* 2. *That the primary Reaſon, Why the Embaſſadour is admitted, is his own credit, to which correſpond the motives of Credibility of the Church, by which the Letters of Credence are admitted.* 3. *That none can give authority to the Letters of Credence, or be Infallibly certain of them, but ſuch as Infallibly know that Hand and Seal.* 4. *That none can Infallibly know that Hand and Seal, but ſuch as are certain of the Embaſſadours ſincerity.* But, Doth all this diſprove what his *Lordſhip* ſaith, That though there be a *mutual Teſtimony*, yet it *is not equal*; for, although the *Letters of Credence* might be the ſooner read and admitted of, on the *Embaſſadour's Reputation* and Sincerity, yet ſtill thoſe *Letters* themſelves, upon the delivery of them, may further, and in a higher degree, confirm the *Prince* he is ſent to, of his *authority* to act as *Embaſſadour*. Suppoſing then, that there be a ſufficient *Teſtimony*, that theſe *Letters* were ſealed by the *Secretary* of *State*, who did manifeſt his *Sincerity* in the higheſt manner in the *ſealing* of them; though a *Foreign Prince* might not know the *Hand and Seal*, yet upon ſuch a creditable Teſtimony, he may be aſſured that they were *ſealed* by the *Prince* himſelf. But then withal, if the *Embaſſadour*, to aſſure the *Prince*, offers his own *Life* to atteſt the truth of his *Credentials*, and the *Prince* by reading the *Letters*, find ſomething in them which could not be written by any other than that *Prince*, he then hath the higheſt certainty he can deſire. This is the caſe between *Tradition* and *Scripture*, *General Tradition* at firſt makes way for the firſt admiſſion of *Scripture*, as the general repute of an *Embaſſadours* coming doth for his *acceſs* to the *Prince*; the particular *Tradition* of the *Church*, is like the *Embaſſadours* affirming to the *Prince*, that he hath Letters of *Credence* with him; but then, when he enquires into the *Certainty* of thoſe *Letters*, thoſe *Motives* of *Credibility* (not which relate to the *Perſon* of the *Embaſſadour*) but which evidently prove the *ſealing* of thoſe *Letters* (as the conſtant *Teſtimony* of ſuch who were preſent at it, the *Secretaries* and *Embaſſadours* venturing their lives upon it) muſt confirm him in that; and laſtly, his own reading the *Credentials*, give him the higheſt *Confirmation*, i. e. The Teſtimony of thoſe who ſaw the Miracles of *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, and confirmed the *Truth* of their *Teſtimony*, by their dying for it, are the higheſt inducement to our believing that the *Scriptures* were ſealed by *God* himſelf in the Miracles wrought, and written by his own hand, his *Spirit* infallibly aſſiſting the *Apoſtles*; but ſtill, after all this, when in theſe very *Scriptures* we read ſuch things as we cannot reaſonably ſuppoſe could come from any but *God* himſelf; this doth in the higheſt degree ſettle and confirm our *Faith*. Therefore, as to the main ſcope for which this Similitude was uſed by his *Lordſhip*, it holds ſtill; but your miſtake lies, in ſuppoſing that the *Embaſſadour's* reception depended wholly on his own ſingle *Teſtimony*, and that was enough to make any *Prince* infallibly certain that his Letters of *Credence* are true, which cannot be, unleſs he knows before-hand that *Embaſſadour* to be *infallibly true*, which is impoſſible to be ſuppoſed at his firſt reception. Yet this is plainly your caſe, that the *Scriptures* are to be infallibly believed on the ſingle Teſtimony of the *preſent Church*, which is, to make the *Embaſſadour* himſelf give *authority* to his *Letters* of *Credence*, and ſet *Hand and Seal* to them. Whereas the contrary is moſt evident to be true. But then, ſuppoſing theſe *Credentials* admitted, the *Prince* tranſacts with the *Embaſſadour*, according to that *Power* which is

conveyed to him therein. And thus it is in the present case: Not as though a *Prince* treated every *Envoy* with equal respect to an *Embassadour*, no more ought any *Pastors* of the *Church* be received, but according to that power and authority which their *Credentials*, *viz.* the *Scriptures* do convey to them. We own therefore the *Apostles* as *God's* immediate *Embassadours*, whose *Miracles* did attest their Commission from Heaven to all they came to; and no Persons could pretend ignorance that this is *God's Hand and Seal*; but all other *Pastors* of the *Church* we look on only as *Agents* settled to hold *correspondency* between *God* and *Us*, but not extraordinary *Embassadours*, who must be looked on as immediately transacting by the *Infallible Commission* of *Heaven*. When therefore the *Pastor* or *Pastors* of your *Church* shall bring new *Credentials* from Heaven, attested with the same *Broad-seal* of *Heaven*, which the *Apostles* had, *viz. Miracles*, we shall then receive them in the same capacity as *Apostles*, *viz.* acting by an *Infallible Commission*, but not till then. By which I have given a sufficient Answer to what follows, concerning the credit which is given to *Christ's Legates* as to himself; for hereby it appears they are to have no greater authority than their *Commission* gives them. Produce therefore an Infallible *Commission* for your *Pastors Infallibility*, either apart, or conjunctly, and we shall receive it; but not else. Whether *A. C.* in the words following, doth in terms attribute *Divine and Infallible Authority to the Church, supposing it infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost*, is very little material; for, Whether he owns it or no, it is sufficient that it necessarily follows from his Doctrine of *Infallibility*. For, How can the *Church* be infallible by virtue of those *Promises*, wherein *Divine Infallibility*, you say, is promised, and by virtue of which the *Apostles* had *Divine Infallibility*, and yet the *Church* not to be *Divinely Infallible?* The remainder of this Chapter, which concerns the *sense* of the *Fathers* in this Controversie, will particularly be considered in the next, which is purposely designed for it.

CHAP. IX.

The Sense of the Fathers in this Controversie.

The Judgment of Antiquity enquired into, especially of the three first Centuries; and the Reasons for it. The several Testimonies of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, *and all the Fathers who writ in vindication of Christian Religion, manifested to concur fully with our way of resolving Faith.* T. C.*'s Answers to* Vincentius Lirinensis, *à* Gandavo, *and the Fathers produced by his Lordship, pitifully weak. The particulars of his ninth Chapter examined.* St. Augustine*'s Testimony vindicated.* T. C.*'s nauseous Repetitions sent as Vagrants to their several homes. His Lordship's Considerations found too heavy for* T. C.*'s Answers. In what sense the Scripture may be called a Præcognitum. What way the* Jews *resolved their Faith. This Controversie, and the first Part, concluded.*

§. 1. HAving thus largely considered, whatever you could pretend to, for the advantage of your own cause, or the prejudice of ours, from *Reason* and *Scripture*; nothing can be supposed to remain considerable, but the judgment of the *Primitive Church* in this present Controversie. And next to *Scripture* and *Reason*, I attribute so much to the sense of the *Christian Church* in the *Ages* next succeeding the *Apostles*, that it is no mean con-

confirmation to me of the truth of the *Proteſtant Way of Reſolving Faith*, and of the *falſity of yours*, that I ſee the one ſo exactly concurring, and the other ſo apparently contrary to the unanimous *Conſent* of *Antiquity*. For, though you love to make a great noiſe with *Antiquity*, among Perſons meanly converſant in it; yet thoſe who do ſeriouſly and impartially enquire into the ſenſe of the *Primitive Church*, and not gueſs at it by the *Shreds* of *Citations* to your hands in your own writers (which is generally your way) will ſcarce in any thing more palpably diſcern your juggling and impoſtures than in your pretence to *Antiquity*. I ſhall not here enquire into the Corruptions crept into your *Church* under that *diſguiſe*, but, as occaſion is miniſtred to me, in the following diſcourſe, ſhall endeavour to *pluck* it off, but ſhall keep cloſe to the matter in queſtion. Three things then I deſign in this Chapter.

1. To ſhew the Concurrence of *Antiquity* with us in the reſolution of Faith.

2. Examine what you produce from thence, either to aſſert your own way, or enervate ours.

3. Conſider what remains of this Controverſie in your Book.

1. For the manifeſting the Concurrence of *Antiquity* with us; I ſhall confine my preſent diſcourſe to the moſt pure and genuine *Antiquity*, keeping within the compaſs of the *three firſt Centuries*, or at leaſt, of thoſe who have purpoſely writ in vindication of the *Chriſtian Faith*. Not that I do in the leaſt diſtruſt the conſent of the *ſucceeding* Writers of the *Primitive Church*, but upon theſe Reaſons. 1. Becauſe it would be too large a *task* at preſent to undertake, ſince no neceſſity from what you object, but only my deſire to clear the *Truth*, and rectifie the *Miſtakes* of ſuch, who are led blindfold under the pretence of *Antiquity*, hath led me to this diſcourſe. 2. Becauſe in reaſon they could not but underſtand beſt the ways and methods uſed by the *Apoſtles* for the perſwading Men to the *Chriſtian Faith*; and if they had mentioned any ſuch thing as an *Infallibility* always to continue in the *Church*, thoſe *Paſtors* certainly who received the care of the *Church* from the *Apoſtles* hands, could not but have heard of it: And were ſtrangely to blame if they did not diſcover and make uſe of it. Whatever therefore of truly *Apoſtolical Tradition*, is to be relied on in ſuch caſes, muſt be conveyed to us from thoſe Perſons who were the *Apoſtles immediate Succeſſors*; and if it can be made manifeſt that they heard not of any ſuch thing, in that, when occaſion was offered, they are ſo far from mentioning it, that they take ſuch different ways of ſatisfying Men, which do manifeſtly ſuppoſe that they did not believe it. I know ſome of the greateſt *Patrons* of the *Church of Rome*, and ſuch who know beſt how to manage things with the beſt advantage for the intereſt of that *Church*, have made little account of the *three firſt Ages*, and confined themſelves within the compaſs of the *four firſt Councils*, upon this pretence, becauſe the *Books* and *Writers* are ſo *rare* before, and that thoſe *Perſons* who lived then, had no occaſion to write of the matters in Controverſie between them and us. But if the ground why thoſe other things which are not determined in *Scripture*, are to be believed by us, and practiſed as neceſſary, be, that they were *Apoſtolical Traditions*, Who can be more competent *Judges* what was ſo, and what not, than thoſe who lived neareſt the *Apoſtolical times*? And thoſe certainly (if they writ of any thing) could not write of any thing of more concernment to the *Chriſtian World*, than the knowledge of ſuch things would be; or at leaſt we cannot imagine but that we ſhould find expreſs intimations of them, where ſo many, ſo wiſe, and

learned

learned Perſons do induſtriouſly give an account of themſelves, and their ſolemn actions to their *Heathen Perſecutors*. But however ſilent they may be in other things, which they neither heard, nor thought of, as in the Cuſtoms controverted between the *Papiſts* and us (which, no doubt, is the true reaſon why the *three firſt Ages* are declined by *Cardinal Perron*) yet there is not the leaſt ſhadow of pretence, why they ſhould be ſilent in this preſent Controverſie, ſince the great buſineſs of their writings was to vindicate the *Chriſtian Faith*, to perſwade the *Heathens* to believe it, and to manifeſt the grounds on which they were induced to believe themſelves. If therefore in this they do unanimouſly concur with that *Reſolution of Faith* I have already laid down, nothing can be deſired more for the evidence and confirmation of the truth of our way, than that it is not only moſt conſonant to *Scripture*, but built on the trueſt *Reaſon*, and was the very ſame which the *Primitive Chriſtians* uſed when they gave an *account of their Faith*: Which I ſhall do, not by ſome mangled *Citations*, but deducing it from the ſcope and deſign of their writings, and drawing it ſucceſſively down from the firſt after the *Apoſtles*, who appeared in *Vindication* of the *Chriſtian Faith*.

§. 2. I begin with *Juſtin Martyr*, who, as *Photius* ſaith of him, was ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ χρόνου πόρρω τῶν Ἀποστόλων, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς, *not far from the Apoſtles either in time or virtue*; and who being a profeſſed *Philoſopher* before he became a *Chriſtian*, we may in reaſon think, that he was more inquiſitive into the *grounds of Chriſtian Faith*, before he believed, and the more able to give an account of them, when he did. Whether therefore we conſider thoſe *Arguments* which firſt induced him to believe, or thoſe whereby he endeavours to perſwade others to it, we ſhall find how conſonant and agreeable he is to our *grounds* of *Faith*, how far from any imagination of the *Churches Infallibility*. In the beginning of his excellent *Dialogue* with *Trypho*, (if I may conjecture) he repreſents the manner of his Converſion in a *Platonical way*, introducing a ſolemn Conference between himſelf, and an ancient Perſon of great Gravity, and a venerable aſpect in a ſolitary place, whither he was retired for his Meditations. *Pet. Halloix* is much troubled who this Perſon ſhould be, Whether an *Angel* in humane ſhape, or a Man immediately conveyed by an *Angel* to diſcover *Chriſtianity* to him, which when he had done, he was as ſuddenly carried back again. *Scultetus* (I ſuppoſe from the Story) aſſerts *Juſtin Martyr* to be converted by *Divine Revelation*. But, if I be not much miſtaken, this whole *Conference* is no more than the ſetting forth the grounds of his becoming a *Chriſtian* in the *Platonical Mode*, by way of *Dialogue* (and probably the whole *Diſputation* with *Trypho*, may be nothing elſe) but, however that be, it is apparent *Trypho* looked on him as a *Platoniſt*, by his *Pallium*, and *Juſtin Martyr* owns himſelf to have been ſo, and therefore it was very congruous for him to diſcourſe after the *Academick manner*. In which Diſcourſe, when *Juſtin Martyr* had ſtood up in vindication of the *Platonick Philoſophy*, the other Perſon endeavours to convince him of the impoſſibility of attaining true happineſs by any *Philoſophy*. For when *Juſtin* had ſaid, That by *Philoſophy* he came to the *Knowledge of God*; the other Perſon demanded, How they could know *God*, who had never ſeen him, nor heard of him? He replied, That the τὸ θεῖον was μόνῳ νῷ καταλητὸν, *God was only intelligible by our Minds, as* Plato *ſaid*: He again asks, *Whether there were ſuch a Faculty in the Minds of Men, as to be able to ſee God without a Divine Power and Spirit aſſiſting it? Juſtin* anſwers, That according to *Plato*, *the Eye of the Underſtanding was ſufficient to diſcover*

Phot. bibliotb. Cod. 234.

Pet. Halloix in vit. Juſt. Mart. cap. 2. in not.

Medulla Patr. p. 9.

diſcover that there is ſuch a Being, which is the cauſe of all things, but the nature of it is ineffable and incomprehenſible. Upon which he proceeds to enquire, What *relation there was between God and the Souls of Men, and what means to come to the participation of him*; after a great deal of diſcourſe on which ſubject between them, *Juſtin* comes at laſt to enquire, *if there were not truth and certainty in Philoſophy, By whoſe inſtruction, or by what means he ſhould come to it?* To which that Perſon returns this excellent Anſwer, *That there had been, a long time ſince, ſeveral Perſons much elder than the reputed Philoſophers, bleſſed Men, juſt, and lovers of God, ſpeaking by the Inſpiration of the Divine Spirit, foretelling things which have come to paſs ſince, whom they call Prophets. Theſe only ſaw the Truth, and declared it to Men; neither flattering, nor fearing any, nor conquered with the love of honour: But they only ſpake the things which they heard and ſaw, being filled with the Holy Spirit. Whoſe Books are ſtill extant; which, whoſoever reads, and aſſents to, will find himſelf much improved in the principles and ends of things, and whatever becomes a Philoſopher to know. For, they writ not by way of argument or demonſtration, but, that which is above it, they are moſt faithful witneſſes of Truth. For the things which have, and do come to paſs, do enforce Men to believe the Truth of what they ſpake: And not only ſo, but they are moſt worthy to be believed, for the Miracles which they wrought. Moreover, they extol the Maker of the World, God and the Father, and declare to the World his Son Chriſt: Which the falſe Prophets, who are acted by a ſeducing and impure Spirit, neither have done, nor yet do do; but they attempt to ſhew ſome tricks for the amazement of Men, and cry up the evil and deceiving Spirits. But, do thou, above all things, pray, that the gates of light may be opened to thee. For theſe things are not ſeen nor underſtood by all, but only by them to whom God and Chriſt ſhall grant the knowledge of them.* A moſt ſignal and remarkable Teſtimony (as any is extant in all Antiquity) for acquainting us with the true *Grounds* and *Reaſons* of *Faith*, which therefore I have at large produced. The very reading of which is ſufficient to tell us, How true a *Proteſtant* this, whether *Angel* or *Man*, was. When *Juſtin* asked him, *What Teachers he ſhould have to lead him to Truth*; He tells him, There had been long before *Philoſophers*, excellent Perſons in the World, called *Prophets*, Men every way good, who did nothing for Fear, or Favour, or Love of themſelves. But *Juſtin* might further ask, *How he ſhould come to be inſtructed by them?* He tells him, Their *Writings* were ſtill *extant*, wherein were contained ſuch things as might hugely ſatisfie a *Philoſophical* Mind, concerning the *Origine* and *Principles* of things. He might ſtill enquire, *Whether thoſe things were demonſtrated or no, in them?* No, he replies; but they deſerve aſſent

Ἐγένοντό τινες πρὸ πολλῶ χρόνω, πάντων τούτων τῶν νομιζομένων φιλοσόφων παλαιότεροι, μακάριοι καὶ δίκαιοι, καὶ θεοφιλεῖς, θείῳ πνεύματι λαλήσαντες, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα θεσπίσαντες, ἃ δὴ νῦν γίνεται, προφήτας δὲ αὐτοὺς καλοῦσιν· οὗτοι μόνοι τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἐξεῖπον ἀνθρώποις, μήτ' ἐυλαβηθέντες, μήτε δυσωπηθέντες τινὰ, μὴ ἡτημένοι δόξης, ἀλλὰ μόνα ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἃ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἃ εἶδον, ἁγίῳ πληρωθέντες πνεύματι. Συγγεγράμμαται δὲ αὐτῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένει, καὶ ἔστιν ἐντυχόντα τούτοις πλεῖστον ὠφεληθῆναι καὶ περὶ ἀρχῶν, καὶ περὶ τέλους, καὶ ὧν χρὴ εἰδέναι τὸν φιλόσοφον, πεπόνθασιν ἐκείνοις. οὐ γὰρ μετὰ ἀποδείξεως πεποιήνται τότε τοὺς λόγους, ἅτε ἀνωτέρω πάσης ἀποδείξεως ὄντες ἀξιόπιστοι μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας· τὰ δὲ γενόμενα καὶ γινόμενα ἐξαναγκάζει συνπάσχειν τοῖς λελαλημένοις δι' αὐτῶν· καὶ τοίγε καὶ διὰ τὰς δυνάμεις ἃς ἐπετέλεσαν, πεπόνθασι δίκαιοι ὄντες· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα ἐδόξαζον, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ χρισθέντα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ κατήγγελλον, ὅπερ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος ἐμπεπλάμενοι φαύλως προφῆται, ἔτε ἐποίησαν, ἔτε ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεις τινὰς ἐνεργεῖν εἰς καταπληξιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τολμῶσι· καὶ τὰ τῆς πλάνης πανδήμαλα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἔχε δὲ σοι περὶ πάντων, φωτὸς ἀνοιχθῆναι πύλας· οὐ γὰρ συνοπτὰ, οὐδὲ συννόητα πᾶσίν ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ τῷ Θεὸς δῷ συνιέναι καὶ ὁ χριστὸς αὐτοῦ. Juſtin. Martyr. Dialog. c. Tryph. p. 224, 225. ed. Pariſ. 1636.

as much, it not beyond any demonſtration; becauſe they manifeſt themſelves to be from God, by two things, the exact accompliſhment of the *Prophecies* made by them, and the unparallel'd *Miracles* which were wrought by them. *But, might not the evil Spirits work ſuch things?* No: For, although their falſe *Prophets* may do ſeveral things to amaze Men, yet they can do no ſuch *Miracles* as they did; beſides, all which they do, tends to advance theſe *evil Spirits* in the World; but the deſign of the true *Prophets*, is to declare the *True God, and his Son Chriſt.* But, *May then any one, by the innate power of his mind, yield a divine aſſent to theſe things?* No: But, pray earneſtly to God to enlighten your mind; for this is the effect of *Divine Grace*, in and *through Chriſt.* What part is there now of our *reſolution of Faith*, which is not herein aſſerted? If you ask, *Why you believe there were ſuch Men in the World as theſe Prophets?* The continuance of their Books and common Fame ſufficiently atteſt it. If you ask, *Why you ſhould believe them to be true Prophets?* The *excellency* of their *Doctrine*, joyned with the *fulfilling Prophecies*, and *working Miracles*, abundantly prove it. But if you laſtly ask, *Whether, beſides objective evidence, there be not ſome higher efficient requiſite to produce a Divine Faith*; The Anſwer is, That depends upon the *Grace of God in Chriſt:* So that here we have moſt evidently all thoſe things concurring, which his Lordſhip aſſerts in the *reſolution of Faith*; *Moral inducement preparing the Mind, rational evidence* from the thing into which *Faith* is reſolved, and *Divine Grace* requiſite in the nature of an *efficient cauſe.* But, Where is there the leaſt intimation of any *Churches Infallibility* requiſite to make Men believe with a *firm and Divine Faith?* No doubt that was a *Divine Faith*, which *Juſtin* was bid to pray ſo heartily for, and which was only in thoſe *to whom it was given*, and yet even this *Faith* had no other aſſurance to build it ſelf upon, but that *rational evidence* which is before diſcovered. *That Divine Perſon never thought of Mens believing with their Wills, much leſs that the Books of Scripture had no more evidence of themſelves, than diſtinction of Colours to a blind Man; he did not think Chriſt an Ignoramus or Impoſtor, becauſe he left no Church Infallible, nor that God by the Prophets laid a Foundation upon Sand, or that would laſt but a few Years, becauſe he did not continue ſuch an Infallible Aſſiſtance as the Prophets had to the Church in all Ages*; yet theſe are all brave *Aſſertions* of yours; which, doubtleſs, you would be aſhamed of, and recant, if you had not, as *Caſaubon* ſaith of the *Perſon* whom you could not tell whether he was a *Jeſuite* or no (but by that Character you might gueſs it) that he had *frontem ferream, & cor involutum*; a *brow of Steel*, and a *Heart full of Meanders* (to uſe your own fine expreſſion.) Upon this, *Juſtin* tells us, *a divine ardour was raiſed in his mind, and a love of the Prophets and ſuch as were the Friends of Chriſt*, and, upon further conſideration, ταύτην μόνον εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον, *I found this the only certain and profitable Philoſophy*; and thereupon commends the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* to *Trypho* and his *Company* for ſomething which was certainly innate to it, that it had a kind of awe and majeſty in it, and is excellent at terrifying and perſwading thoſe who were out of the right way, and brings the ſweeteſt tranquillity to ſuch as are converſant in it. And afterwards undertakes to demonſtrate the truth of our Religion from the *reaſonableneſs* of it, *that we have not yielded our aſſent to vain and empty Fables, nor to aſſertions uncapable of evidence and demonſtration; but to ſuch as are filled with a Divine Spirit, overflowing with Power, and flouriſhing with Grace.* And accor-

Παρεσῶτι γὰρ δείξω, ὅτι ὃ κενοῖς ἐπέσθαι οὐ μύθοις, οὐδὲ ἀναποδείκτοις λόγοις, ἀλλὰ μεστοῖς πνεύματος θείου, καὶ δυνάμει ἐρύσῃ, καὶ τεθηλόσι χάριτι. Id. p. 226.

accordingly manageth his discourse quite through, shewing the insufficiency of the *Ceremonial Law*, and the *Truth* and *Excellency both of the Person and Doctrine of Christ*. But what need all this, if he had believed your Doctrine? It had been but proving the *Church Infallible* by *Motives of Credibility*; and then to be sure, whatever was propounded to be believed by it, was *infallibly true*. But *older and wiser*, it seems, must hold here too; *Justin*, tho' so near the Apostles times, went a much further way about: but it was well for him he lived so long ago, else he might have been accused of *Heresie*, or making Faith *uncertain*, if he had lived in our times, and such Doctrine of his might have merited an *Index Expurgatorius*.

But, it seems, he was not afraid of it then, for he often elsewhere speaks to the same purpose. For, in his *Paræneſis* to the *Greeks*, he makes it his business, first to shew the *unreasonableness* of believing those who were the great *Authors* of all their *superstitions*; for the *Poets* were manifestly *ridiculous*, the *Philosophers* at continual *dissentions* among themselves, so that there was no relying on them for the finding out of *Truth*, or the redress of the *miseries* of humane nature; and then comes to the Authours of our *Religion*, who were both much *elder* than any of theirs, and did not teach any thing of their own heads, nor dissented from one another in what they delivered, or sought to confute each other as the *Philosophers* did, but ἀφιλονείκως καὶ ἀστασιάστως, *without all jarring and contention*, they delivered to Men the *Doctrine* which they received from *God*. *For*, (saith he) *it was not possible for them to know such great and divine things by nature, or humane wit, but by a heavenly gift descending from above upon holy Men*. It seems, *Justin* believed there was such evidence in the matters contained in *Scripture*, which might perswade Men to believe that they came from *God*; that they were but as *instruments* to that τὸ θεῖον πλῆκτρον (as he expresseth it) to that *Divine Spirit which did strike upon them*; whence, with one consent and harmony they sound forth the *Doctrine* of *God*, the *worlds Creation and Man's*, *the Immortality of the soul*, *Judgement to come*, and all things else which are necessary for us to know, which they unanimously deliver to us, though at great distances from each other, both in regard of time and place. And so proves the *Antiquity* of the *Writings* of *Moses* above all the *Wise Men* of the *Greeks*, by the testimony of their own Authors, *Polemon*, *Appion*, *Ptolomæus Mendesius*, and many others, and concludes his discourse with this speech, *That it is impossible for us to know any thing certainly concerning God or Religion, but from Divine Inspiration, which alone was in the Prophets*. In his first *Apology* for the *Christians*, he tells us what it was, while he was a *Platonist*, which brought him to a good Opinion of *Christianity*, which was, the observing *the power and efficacy that Doctrine had upon the Christians to undergoe with so much courage what was accounted most terrible to humane nature (which are, death and torments.)* From whence he reasoned with himself, that although the *Christians* were so much calumniated, yet certainly they *could not be vitious persons, who were so little fearful of those great Bug-bears of humane nature. For, Who is there, that is a lover of pleasure, or intemperate, or cruel, that can chearfully embrace death, so as thereby to be deprived of all his goods?* And when he speaks of the Doctrine it self of Christianity, he says, It is suitable to whatever was *rational* among the *Platonists* or other *Philosophers*, but far more agreeable to it self, and con-

§. 3.

Paranes. p. 9.

Οὔτε γὰρ φύσει, οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ οὔτε μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γινώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατὸν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας τηνικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾷ. Id. ib.

Apolog. 1. *p.* 50.

Τίς γὰρ φιλήδονος, ἢ ἀκρατὴς, καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν βορὰν ἀγαθὸν ἡγούμενος, δύναιτο ἂν θάνατον ἀσπάζεσθαι, ὅπως τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν στερηθῇ. Id. ib.

taining much more *excellent things* than ever they could attain to the
P. 51, 52. knowledge of. In his second *Apology* for the *Christians* to the *Emperour Antoninus Pius*, he insists much on the excellency of the *Doctrine* of *Chri-*
P. 61, 62 &c. *stianity* from the *Precepts* of it, *chastity*, *love of enemies*, *liberality*, *submission to authority*, *worship of God*, &c. Afterwards he proves the *truth*
P. 73. and *certainty* of all we believe concerning *Christ* from the exact *accomplishment of the Prophesies* made concerning him in the Old *Testament*, which discourse he ends with this saying. *So many and so great things being seen, are sufficient to perswade Men to believe the truth of them, who are lovers of truth, and not seekers of applause, and under the command of passions.* Thus we see, in all his discourses, where he had the most occasion administred to him, to discover the most *certain grounds of Christian Faith*, he resolves all into the *rational evidence* of the *truth*, *excellency*, and *divinity* of the *Doctrine* which was contained in the *Scriptures*. For in his second *Oration* to the *Greeks*, after he had spoken highly in commendation of the *Scripture*, calling it, *The best expeller of all turbulent passions, and the surest extinguisher of those preternatural heats in the souls of Men*; *which* (saith he) *makes Men not Poets, nor Philosophers, nor Orators, but it makes* τοὺς θνητοὺς ἀθανάτους, τοὺς βροτοὺς θεοὺς, *dying Men immortal, and mortals become Gods*; *and transfers them from the earth*, εἰς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Ὄλυμπον ὄρους, *to such places whose confines are far above* Olympus; *therefore, O ye Greeks, come and be instructed*; *be ye as I am, for I was as you are. And these were the things which prevailed with me, the divine power and efficacy of the Doctrine.* What was it then, I pray, that *Justin Martyr*, of a *Philosopher* becoming a *Christian*, resolved his *Faith* into? If we may believe himself, it was into the *evidence* of the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, and not into the *Infallibility* of any *Church*. The Testimony of this person, I have the more largely insisted on, both because he was so great a *Philosopher*, as well as *Christian*, and lived so near the *Apostolical times*. Next him we produce *Athenagoras* as a *Philosopher* too, as well as *Christian*, who flourished under *Antoninus* and *Commodus*, to whom he made his *Apology* in behalf of the *Christians*, in which he first undertakes to manifest the reasonableness of the *Doctrine* which they owned, the *Foundation* of it being the same with that which the best *Philosophers* acknowledged, the *existence* and *unity* of the *Deity*. *But* (saith he) *if we had nothing but such reasons as he had produced, our perswasion could only be humane*; *but the words of the Prophets are they which establish our minds.*——*who being carried beyond themselves, by the impulse of the Divine Spirit, spake that which they were moved to, when the Spirit used them as Instruments through which he spake.* Is not here a plain *resolution* of *Faith* into that *Divine Authority* by which the *Prophets* spake? and that not as testified by any *Infallible Church*, but as it was discernable by those persons he spake to, for he appeals to the *Emperours* themselves concerning it; which had been a fond and absurd thing for him to do, if the knowledge of that *Divine Inspiration* did depend meerly on the testimony of *Christians* as such, and were not to be discovered by some *common Principles* to them and others. Much to the same

Τὰ τοσαῦτα γοῦν ὁρώμενα, πειθὼ καὶ πίστιν τοῖς τ' ἀληθὲς ἀσπαζομένοις, καὶ μὴ φιλοδοξοῦσιν, μηδὲ ὑπὸ παθῶν ἀρχομένοις, μετὰ λόγου ἐμφορῆσαι δύναται. Apol. 2. p. 89.

Ὦ παθῶν δεινῶν φυγαδευτήριον, ὦ πυρὸς ἐμψύχου σβεστικὸν διδασκαλεῖον. Orat. 2. p. 40.

Ταῦτά με εἷλε, τό τε τῆς παιδείας Ἔνθεον καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου δυνατόν. Id. Ib.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ αἱ φωναὶ τῶν προφητῶν πιστοῦσιν ἡμῶν τοὺς λογισμοὺς.——οἱ κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ἃ ἐνεργοῦντο ἐξεφώνησαν· συγχρησαμένου τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡσεὶ καὶ αὐλητὴς αὐλὸν ἐμπνεύσαι. Athenag. Apol. p. 9.

ſame purpoſe *Tatianus* ſpeaks in that eloquent Oration of his againſt the *Greeks*, who was *Juſtin Martyr's* Scholar; and we ſhall ſee, how agreeable he ſpeaks to him, in the account he gives, how he became a Chriſtian. *After* (ſaith he) *he had abundantly diſcovered the vanity of the Theology, and Superſtitions of the* Greeks, *he fell to the reading ſome ſtrange Books, much elder and more Divine than the Writings of the* Greek *Philoſophers. And to theſe* (ſaith he) *I yielded up my Faith, for the great ſimplicity and plainneſs of the ſtile, and the freedom from affectation which was in the writers; and that evidence and perſpicuity which was in all they writ; and becauſe they foretold things to come, made excellent promiſes, and manifeſtly declared the Monarchy of the World.* What *Proteſtant* could ſpeak higher of the *Scripture*, and of thoſe internal *Arguments* which are the grounds of *Faith* than *Tatianus* in theſe words doth? Yet we ſee, theſe were the arguments which made him relinquiſh the *Greek* Learning of which he was a *Profeſſor* at *Rome*, and betake himſelf to the profeſſion of *Chriſtianity*; though he was ſure to undergo not only contempt from the World, but to be in continual hazard of his life by it. That innate *ſimplicity* of the *Writings of the Scripture* joyned with the *perſpicuity* of it (if at leaſt thoſe words be rightly tranſlated τῆς τε πάνυ ποιήσεως τὸ ἐυκατάλληπτον by *ſermo nuſquam obſcurus*, and it doth not rather relate *to the account of the Worlds Creation*, which I conjecture it may do) but however, *the certainty of the predictions, the excellency of the promiſes*, and the *reaſonableneſs of the Doctrine* were the *things*, which by the *reading* of the *Books* he was perſwaded to believe them by. But all this while we hear no news of any *Churches Infallibility* in order to *Faith.*

Καὶ μοι πειθῆναι ταύτας συνέβη, διότε τῶν λέξεων τὸ ἀπύφον καὶ τῶν εἰπόντων τὸ ἀνεπιτήδευτον, καὶ ἔτι τῆς πάνυ ποιήσεως τὸ ἐυκατάλληπτον, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων τὸ προγνωστικὸν, καὶ τῶν προαγγελμάτων τὸ ἐξαίσιον, καὶ τῶν ὅλων τὸ μοναρχικόν Tatianus. p. 165.

We come therefore to *Irenæus*, who was *omnium doctrinarum curioſiſſimus explorator*, as *Tertullian* ſpeaks of him, *a great ſearcher into all kind of learning*, and therefore ſurely not to ſeek as to the true account of his *Faith.* Whoſe judgment herein, although we have had occaſion to enquire into before, yet we have Teſtimonies enough beſide to manifeſt his conſent with them. And although *Irenæus* of all the ancient *Fathers* be looked on as the moſt favourable to *Tradition*, and is moſt cited to that purpoſe in theſe diſputes; yet I doubt not but to make it appear, that where he ſpeaks moſt concerning *Tradition*, he makes the *reſolution* of *Faith* to be wholly and intirely into the *Scripture:* and they who apprehend otherwiſe do either take the *citations* out of him upon truſt, or elſe only ſearch him for the *words* of thoſe *citations*, and never take the pains to enquire into the ſcope and deſign of his diſcourſe. For clearing which, we muſt conſider, what the *ſubject* was which he writ of, what the *pleas* of the adverſe party were, what way *Irenæus* takes to confute them, and to eſtabliſh the *Faith* of Chriſtians as to the matter which was in Controverſie. The matter in diſpute was this, *Valentinius* and his *Scholars*, not being contented with the *ſimplicity* of the *Doctrine* of the *Goſpel*, and in probability the better to ſuit their *opinions* to the *Heathen Mythology*, and invented a ſtrange *Pedigree* of *Gods*, the better as they pretended to give an account of the *production of things*, and the various *diſpenſations* which had been in the *world:* but knowing that the *Chriſtians* did with the greateſt reſolution adhere to that *Doctrine* which was delivered by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, they could not ſuppoſe that they ſhould embrace theſe *figments* unleſs

§. 4. *C. Valentin: cap.* 5.

less they could some way or other *father* them upon *them*. Upon which they pretended that these very *things* which they delivered were really intended by *Christ* and the *Apostles* in their writings, but because so few were capable of them, they gave only some *intimations* of them there, but delivered these great *mysteries* privately only to those who were *perfect*; and that this was St. *Paul*'s meaning when he said, *I speak wisdom among them that are perfect*. This *Irenæus* gives us an account of, in the beginning of all his discourse: but is more fully expressed in the original *Greek* of *Irenæus* preserved by *Epiphanius* in the heresie of the *Valentinians*. On which account alone, as *Petavius* saith, *Epiphanius* hath well deserved of *Posterity*, for preserving entire those original *Fragments* of *Irenæus*; his *Greek* therein being much more intelligible and smooth than the *old harsh Latin version* of him. His words are, *All which things are not expressly declared, in as much as all are not fit to understand them; but are mysteriously couched by our Saviour in parables, for such who are able to understand them*, Thus they said, the 30. *Æônes* were represented by the 30. *years* in which our *Saviour* did not appear publickly, and by the Parable of the Works in the Vineyard in which the 1, 3, 6, 9, 11 *hours*, making up 30. did again denote their *Æônes*; and that St. *Paul* did most expressly signifie them, when he used so often εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. The *Duodecad* of *Æônes* by the 12 *years* at which our *Saviour* appeared disputing with the *Doctors*. The raising of *Jairus* his Daughter of 12 *years*, represented *Achamoth* being *brought to light*, whose *passions* were set forth by those words of our Saviour, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me*, in which were three *passions* of *Achamoth, Sorrow, Fear*, and *Despair*. With many things of a like nature; but hereby we sufficiently see what their pretence was, *viz. That there were deep mysteries but obscurely represented in Scripture, but whose full knowledge was delivered down by an Oral Cabala from Christ and his Apostles.*

Iren. l. 1. c. 1. p. 4. ed. Erasm.

Petav. not. in Epiph. in hæres. Valent.

Ταῦτα δὲ φανερῶς μὲν μὴ εἰρῆσθαι, διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντας χωρεῖν τὴν γνῶσιν, μυστηριακῶς δὲ τοῦ Σωτῆρος διὰ παραβολῶν μεμηνῦσθαι τοῖς συνιεῖν δυναμένοις. Iren. apud Epiph. hæres. 31. Sect. 14.

Now we must consider, what course *Irenæus* takes to confute these *pretensions* of theirs. First he gives an account what that *Faith* was, which the *Church* dispersed up and down the World, received from the *Apostles* and their *Disciples*, viz. that thereby *they believed in one God, the Father Almighty, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea and all in them, and in one Jesus Christ the Son of God*, &c. which was directly contrary to the *Valentinian Heresies*, who supposed the Supream God and *Demiurgus* to be different, and so *Christus* and *Salvator*, and so in others. *This Faith which the Church hath received, it unanimously keeps, though dispersed through the whole World; for although the Languages be different, yet the Tradition is the same among them; whether they live in* Germany, France, Spain, *the* East, Ægypt, Libya, *or elsewhere*. And after in the first *Book* he hath shewed the many different opinions of the several *broods* of these *Hereticks*; and in the second discovered the *fondness and ridiculousness* of them; in his third *Book*, he undertakes from *Scripture* to shew the *falseness* of them. And begins with that excellent expression before cited. *For we have not known the disposition (or æconomy) of our Salvation by others than by those, by whom the Gospel came to us, which they then first Preached, and after by the Will of God, delivered to us in writings to be the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith.* Which being laid down by him at his entrance as the grand *Principle* on which he goes, will lead us to an easie understanding of all that follows. This therefore, he not only asserts, but proves. For whereas some of the *Adversaries* pretended that the

L. 1. c. 2.

L. 1. c. 3.

L. 3. c. 1.

Apostles

Apoſtles Preached before they fully *underſtood all they were to know*, he ſhews how falſe that was, becauſe after *Chriſt's Reſurrection* from the *Grave*, they were endued with the *Spirit of God* deſcending from on high upon them; and were furniſhed with a perfect *knowledge* by which they went up and down Preaching the *Goſpel*, which all and each of them had the knowledge of. Thus *Matthew* in the *Hebrew* tongue ſet forth his *Goſpel*, when *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome* Preached the *Goſpel* and founded a *Church*; and after their departure *Mark*, the *Diſciple* and *Interpreter* of *Peter*, writ thoſe things which were Preached. Afterwards *John* publiſhed his *Goſpel* at *Epheſus* in *Aſia*, *And all theſe* (ſaith he) *delivered to us one God maker of Heaven and Earth, and one Chriſt his Son. To whom if one doth not aſſent, he deſpiſeth thoſe who were our Lord's companions, and therefore deſpiſeth our Lord Chriſt, and likewiſe deſpiſeth the Father, and is condemned of himſelf, reſiſting and oppoſing his own Salvation which all Hereticks do.* Can any thing be more plain, than that *Irenæus* makes it his deſign to reſolve *Faith* into the writings of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, and ſaith, That theſe writings were delivered as *a Foundation of Faith* that the *reaſon* why the *Chriſtians* believed but one *God* and one *Chriſt*, was, becauſe they read of no more in the *Goſpels* publiſh'd by them, *That he that deſpiſeth them who were our Lord's companions, deſpiſe himſelf and God, and condemn themſelves.* He doth not ſay, he that deſpiſeth the *lawfully ſent Paſtors of the Church meeting in General Councils, nor them who have power to oblige the Church to believe as well as the Apoſtles had*, as you ſay, but evidently makes the obligation to believe, to depend upon that *revelation* of *God's will*, which was made by the *Apoſtles*, and is by their writings conveyed down to us. Would not the *Valentinians* have thought themſelves preſently run down by ſuch ways of confutation as yours are, that they muſt believe the *preſent Church Infallible* in whatever is delivered to be believed to the world?

Quibus ſi quis non aſſentit, ſpernit quidem participes Domini, ſpernit autem & ipſum Chriſtum Dominum, ſpernit verò & Patrem, & eſt à ſeipſo damnatus, reſiſtens & repugnans ſaluti ſuæ, quod faciunt omnes hæretici. Iren. l. 3. c. 1.

But doth not *Irenæus* himſelf make uſe of the *Churches Tradition* as the great argument to confute them by? I grant he doth ſo, and it is on that very account *that he might confute them*, and not lay down the only ſure *Foundation* of *Chriſtian Faith*. For he gives that reaſon of his doing ſo in the beginning of the very next Chapter. *For*, (ſaith he) *when we diſpute againſt them out of the Scripture, they are turned preſently to an accuſing of the Scriptures as though they were not in all things right, and wanted Authority, and becauſe of their ambiguity, and for that truth cannot be found out by them without the help of Tradition.* I need not ſay, that *Irenæus* propheſied of you in this ſaying of his, but it is as true of you as if he had. Your pretences being the very *ſame* againſt the *Scriptures* being the *rule* of *Faith*, with thoſe of the *Valentinians*; only that you deny not the *truth* of what is therein contained, for otherwiſe the *want of Authority in themſelves*, the *ambiguity of them*, the *impoſſibility of knowing the ſenſe of them without Tradition*, are the very ſame arguments which with the greateſt Pomp and Oſtentation are produced by you againſt the *Scriptures* being the *Rule* whereby to judge of *Controverſies*. Which we have no more cauſe to wonder at, than *Irenæus* had in the *Valentinians*, *becauſe from them we produce our greateſt Arguments againſt your fond Opinions.* Now when the *Valentinians* pretended their great *rule* was on *oral Tradition*, which was conveyed from the *Apoſtles* down to them; to this *Irenæus* oppoſeth the conſtant Tradition of the *Apoſtolical Churches*, which in a

§. 5.

Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accuſationem convertuntur ipſarum Scripturarum, quaſi non rectè habeant, neq; ſint ex authoritate, & quia variè ſint dicta, & quia non poſſit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui neſciant traditionem. Iren. l. 3. c. 2.

continued

continued ſucceſſion was preſerved from the *Apoſtles times*, which was the ſame every where among all the *Churches*, which every one who deſired it, might eaſily be ſatisfied about; becauſe *they could number them, who by the Apoſtles were appointed Biſhops in Churches, and their ſucceſſors, unto our own times, who taught no ſuch thing, nor ever knew any ſuch thing as they madly fancy to themſelves.* We ſee then his *appeal* to *Tradition* was only in a matter of fact, Whether ever any ſuch thing as their opinion which was not contained in *Scripture*, was delivered to them, by the *Apoſtles* or no, *i.e.* Whether the *Apoſtles* left any *oral Traditions* in the *Churches* which ſhould be the rule to interpret *Scriptures* by, or no? And the whole deſign of *Irenæus* is to prove the contrary, by an appeal to all the *Apoſtolical Churches*, and particularly by appealing to the *Roman Church*, becauſe of its due fame and celebrity in that Age wherein *Irenæus* lived. So that *Irenæus* appealed to the then *Roman Church*, even when he ſpeaks higheſt in the honour of it, for ſomewhat which is fundamentally contrary to the *pretenſions* of the *new Roman Church*. He then appealed to it, for an evidence againſt ſuch *oral Traditions* which were pretended to be left by the *Apoſtles* as a rule to underſtand *Scripture* by; and, were it not for this ſame pretence now, what will become of the Authority of the *preſent Roman Church?*

Et habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apoſtolis inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi in Eccleſiis & ſucceſſores eorum uſq; ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neq; cognovêrunt, quale ab his deliratur. L. 3. c. 3.

After he hath thus manifeſted by recourſe to the *Apoſtolical Churches* that there was no ſuch *Tradition* left *among them*, it was very reaſonable to infer that there was *none ſuch at all*; for they could not imagine, if the *Apoſtles* had deſigned any ſuch *Tradition*, but they would have communicated it to thoſe famous *Churches* which were planted by them, and it was abſurd to ſuppoſe that thoſe *Churches* who could ſo eaſily derive their ſucceſſion from the *Apoſtles* ſhould in ſo ſhort a time have loſt the memory of ſo rich a treaſure depoſited with them, as that was pretended to be; from whence he ſufficiently refutes that unreaſonable imagination of the *Valentinians*. Which having done, he proceeds to ſettle thoſe firm *grounds* on which the *Chriſtians* believed in *one God the Father*, and in *one Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, which he doth by removing the only *Objection* which the *Adverſaries* had againſt them. For when the *Chriſtians* declared, the main *reaſon* into which they reſolved their Faith as to the Principles, was, *Becauſe* no other *God or Chriſt* were revealed in *Scripture*, but them whom they believed, the *Valentinians* anſwered, this could not be a ſufficient *foundation* for their *Faith* on this account, becauſe many things were delivered in *Scripture*, not according to the *truth of the things*, but the *judgment and opinion of the Perſons they were ſpoken to.* This therefore being ſuch a *pretence* as would deſtroy any *firm reſolution of Faith into Scripture*, and muſt neceſſarily place it in *Tradition*; *Irenæus* concerns himſelf much to demonſtrate the *contrary*, by an *Oſtenſion* (as he calls it) that *Chriſt and the Apoſtles did all along ſpeak according to truth, and not according to the opinion of their Auditors*, which is the entire ſubject of the fifth *Chapter* of his third *Book*. Which he proves firſt of *Chriſt*, becauſe he was *Truth it ſelf*, and it would be very contrary to his nature to ſpeak of things otherwiſe than they were, when the very deſign of his coming was to direct Men in the way of *Truth*. *The Apoſtles* were *Perſons* who profeſſed to declare *truth* to the World, and as *light* cannot *communicate* with *darkneſs*, ſo neither could *truth* be *blinded* with ſo much *falſhood* as that opinion ſuppoſeth in them. And therefore neither *our Lord* nor his *Apoſtles* could be ſuppoſed to mean any other *God* or *Chriſt* than whom they declared. *For this* (ſaith he) *were rather to increaſe their ignorance and confirm*

them

them in it, than to cure them of it; and therefore that Law was true which pronounced a *curse on every one who led a blind Man out of his way.* And the *Apostles* being sent for the *recovery of the lost sight of the blind*, cannot be supposed to speak to *Men* according to their *present opinion*, but according to the *manifestation* of truth. For, what *Physitian intending to cure a Patient, will do according to his Patients desire, and not rather what will be best for him?* From whence he concludes, Since the *design of Christ* and his *Apostles* was not to flatter but to cure Mens souls; it follows, that they did not speak to them, according to their former *opinion*, but according to *truth* without all *hypocrisie* and *dissimulation.* From whence it follows, that if *Christ* and his *Apostles* did speak according to truth, there is then need of no Oral Tradition for our understanding *Scripture*, and consequently the resolution of our *Faith* as to *God and Christ*, and proportionably as to other objects to be believed, is not into any Tradition pretending to be derived from *the Apostles*, but into the *Scriptures themselves*; which by this discourse evidently appears to have been the *judgement* of *Irenæus.*

The next which follows, is *Clemens* of *Alexandria* who flourished *A. D.* 196. whom St. *Hierom* accounted the *most learned of all the writers of the Church*: and therefore cannot be supposed ignorant in so necessary a part of the *Christian Doctrine* as the *Resolution of Faith* is. And if his judgement may be taken, the *Scriptures* are the only certain *Foundation* of *Faith*; for in his *Admonition* to the *Gentiles* after he hath with a great deal of *excellent learning* derided the *Heathen Superstitions*, when he comes to give an account of the *Christian Faith*, he begins it with this pregnant Testimony to our purpose. *For* (saith he) *the Sacred Oracles affording us the most manifest grounds of Divine worship, are the Foundation of Truth.* And so goes on in a high commendation of the *Scripture*, as the most *compendious directions* for happiness, the *best Institution* for *government of life*, the most *free* from all vain *ornaments*, that they, *raise Mens souls up out of wickedness, yielding the most excellent remedies, dissuading from the greatest deceit*, and most clearly *incouraging to a foreseen happiness*; with more of the same nature. And when after he perswades Men with so much *Rhetorick* and *earnestness* to imbrace the *Scriptures* ἀναπεπταμέναις ταῖς ἀκοαῖς *with the greatest readiness*, he gives this as the reason of it, that so they might ἐν ἁγναῖς ξενοδοχεῖν ταῖς ψυχαῖς τὸν θεὸν, *entertain God in chaste souls. For the Word is that light to Men, by which we see God*: and soon after speaking that the design of Religion is to make Men *like to God as much as possible*, he adds, *That truly they are the Sacred Scriptures which make Men Holy and Deifie Men, i. e.* by Assimilation. And in that large and eloquent *Parenæsis* which follows, wherein he perswades Men to the forsaking their old customs and embracing *Christianity*, all the arguments he useth are drawn from the *Scriptures*, and not so much as the least mention of any *Infallible Ensurancer* of their *truth* and *authority*, but supposeth the *evidence* he produceth, *sufficient* to perswade them to the belief and love of them. In the first of his *Stromata*, he proves the *truth* of the *Scriptures* by the much greater *antiquity* of them than any of the *Greek learning.* In the *second*, where he particularly enquires into the *nature and ground of Faith*, he hath this

§. 6. *Hieron. ep. ad Magnum.*

Καὶ γὰρ οἱ χρησμοὶ, τὰς εἰς τὴν θεοσέβειαν ἡμῖν ἀφορμὰς ἐναργέστατα προτείνοντες, θεμελιοῦσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Clem. Alex. Προτρέπτ. q. 50. ed. Paris.

Φῶς δὲ ὁ λόγος ἀνθρώποις, δι' οὗ καταυγαζόμεθα τὸν θεὸν. p. 55.

Ἱερὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς, τὰ ἱεροποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα. p. 56.

this expression, *He therefore that believes the Sacred Scriptures, having a firm judgement doth receive the voice of God who gave the Scriptures, as an impregnable demonstration.* (Although the text be commonly Printed without the *comma* between ἔχων and ἀπόδειξιν, yet the sense and context makes it evident that it ought to be there, and accordingly *Sylburgius* gives intimation of it in his *notes*, and *Gentian Hervet* in the translation as revised by *Heinsius* applies the demonstration to what follows, but very weakly joyns ἀναντίῤῥητον with κείσιν and not with ἀπόδειξιν, and so renders it *firmum habens judicium cui contradici nequit*, whereas it is plain that he intends to give an account what that foundation is, which *Faith* doth stand on.) And after having made a large discourse concerning the *nature of Faith* comparing the judgement of *Philosophers* concerning it, he concludes with this saying, *That it is an absurd thing for the followers of Pythagoras to suppose that his* ipse dixit, *was instead of a demonstration to them; and yet those who are the lovers of truth not to believe the sure testimony of our only Saviour and God, but to exact proofs of him of what he spake.* Wherein he discovers that *Christianity* required from Men no unreasonable thing in expecting assent where no such kind of proofs as those used by *Philosophers* are; but if the *Epicureans* did suppose some kind of *anticipation* necessary to knowledge, if the *Pythagoreans* relied on *Authority*, if *Heraclitus* quarrell'd with such *as could neither hear nor speak, i. e.* such as neither had *Authority* themselves, and yet would *rely* on none; it could not be judged any *absurd* thing that *Christianity* did require such an *assent* to what *Christ* delivered, especially considering that he was ἀξιόπιστος, *i. e.* that he discovered *sufficient reason* why he was to be believed in whatever he spake. And thence elsewhere he says, *That Faith is a sure demonstration, because truth follows whatever is delivered from God.* And when he gives an account what that *true knowledge* is which the *Christian* hath, he shews what things are requisite to it; two things *Knowledge* supposeth ζήτησις and εὕρεσις, *enquiry and discovery*; the *Enquiry* (saith he) *is an impulse of the mind for the finding out of something by some signs which are proper to it*; *Discovery, is the end and rest of enquiry, which lies in the comprehension of the thing, which is properly Knowledge. Now the signs by which things are discovered, are either precedent, concomitant, or subsequent,* All these he thus applies to the *Scriptures. The discovery, as the end of our enquiry after God, is, the Doctrine delivered by his Son; but the signs whereby we know that he was the Son of God, precedent, are the Propheſies declaring his coming; concomitant, were the Testimonies concerning his birth: subsequent, are those Miracles, which were published, and manifestly shewed to the world after his Ascension. Therefore the peculiar evidence that the truth is with us, is, that the Son of God himself hath taught us.* A

Ὁ πιστεύσας τοίνυν ταῖς γεγραφαῖς ταῖς θείαις, τῳ κρίσιν βεβαίαν ἔχων, ἀπόδειξιν ἀναντίῤῥητον, τῳ τῶ τὰς γραφὰς δεδωκημένῳ φωνῳ λαμβάνει θεῦ. Strom. 2. p. 362.

Τὸς δὲ τ ἀληθείας φιλοθεάμονας, ἀπιστεῖν ἐπιχειρεῖνας ἀξιοπίστῳ διδασκάλῳ τῳ μόνῳ Σωτῆρι Θεῷ, βασάνους τῶν λεγομένων ἀπαιτεῖν παρ ἀυτῦ. p. 369.

Γίνεται τοίνυν αὕτη ἡ πίστις ἀπόδειξις βεβαία, ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῦ θεῦ ὡμολογημένοις ἡ ἀλήθεια ἕπεται. Strom. 6. p. 649.

Τῆς τοίνυν περὶ θεῦ ζητήσεως, εὕρεσις μὲν, ἡ διὰ τῦ υἱῦ διδασκαλία· σημεῖον δὲ τῦ εἶναι τ Σωτῆρα ἡμῶν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τ υἱὸν τῦ θεῦ, αἵ τε προηγούμεναι τ παρουσίας αὐτῦ προφητεῖαι, τῦτον κηρύσσουσαι· αἵ τε συνυπάρξασαι τῇ γενέσει αὐτῦ τῇ καθ ἡμᾶς περὶ αὐτῦ μαρτυρίαι· πρὸς δὲ τ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν κηρυσσόμεναί τε τ ἐμφανῶς ἐνδεικνύμεναι δυνάμεις αὐτῦ· τεκμήριον ἄρα τῦ παρ ἡμῖν εἶναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τὸ αὐτὸν διδαξαι τ υἱὸν τῦ θεῦ. Strom. 6. 674.

place not ſo clear in it ſelf, as miſerably involved through the oſcitancy of the *Latin Interpreter*, in which it is plain, that *Clemens* doth exactly, according to all *rational principles* of *knowledge*, give an account of the *grounds* of *Chriſtian Faith*; the main principle of which, is, the *doctrine delivered by Chriſt*; which, that it ought to be aſſented to, appears by a full *concurrence* of all thoſe *ſigns* which are neceſſary in *enquiries*; here are the greateſt *precedent ſigns* (*Prophecies*, made ſo long before, exactly accompliſhed in him) the *fulleſt concomitant ſigns* (in the many *wonderful things* which happened at his coming into the world) and the cleareſt *ſubſequent ſigns* by thoſe great and uncontrouled *miracles*, which were wrought in the world after his *Aſcenſion*; *all which put together do evidently prove that he was the Son of God who delivered this doctrine to us, and therefore deſerves our moſt firm aſſent in whatever appears to be his Word.* Can any thing then be more apparent than his *reſolution of Faith* into the *rational evidence* of *Chriſts being* the *Son of God*, which is manifeſted to us not by the *Infallible teſtimony* of any *Church*, but by the *Infallible ſigns* of it which were *precedent* to, *attendant* on, and *conſequent* to his appearance in the world. *If therefore* (ſaith he) *according to* Plato, *truth can only be learned, either from God, or thoſe who are come from him, we may juſtly boaſt that we learn the truth from the Son of God, taking the Teſtimonies out of thoſe Sacred Oracles, which were firſt Propheſied and then fully declared, viz.* by accompliſhment. The main ground of *Faith* then, is ſuch as the wiſeſt *Philoſophers* did admit of, viz. *that whatſoever God ſaid is true*, and none can deliver *truth* but ſuch as come from him, on which account there is nothing left, but *evidence* that he in whom we believe was the *Son of God*, which is abundantly manifeſted by the *accompliſhment of thoſe Prophecies* in him which were made ſo long before. After which he diſputes againſt the ſame ſort of *Hereticks* which *Irenæus* did, and upon the *ſame principles*, viz. *that whatever God or Chriſt thought neceſſary for us to know or believe, is conſigned to us in the writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles*; *and thence he cites that out of* Peters κήρυγμα (a Book I ſuppoſe then extant under that name) οὐδὲν ἀπὸ γραφῆς *nothing without the written word*, where was the unwritten word then? And in that end of the *Book* diſcovers the *weakneſs of Philoſophy*, becauſe it came *from meer Men*; *but Men, as Men, are no ſufficient teachers when they ſpeak concerning God. For* (ſaith he) *Man cannot ſpeak* ἀξιοχρέως *things becoming God*; *for being weak and mortal he cannot ſpeak as he ought of a being infinite and immortal, nor he that is the work of him who made it*; *beſides he that cannot ſpeak truth concerning Himſelf, how much leſs is he to be believed concerning God? For as much as Man wants of Divine power, ſo much muſt his ſpeech fall ſhort of God, when he diſcourſeth of him. For Mans ſpeech is naturally weak and unable to expreſs God*; *not only as to his eſſence, but as to his power and works*; *thence he concludes a neceſſity that God by his Spirit muſt diſcover himſelf to Men, which revelation he proves to be only extant among Chriſtians*, becauſe of the many *Divine Teſtimonies*

Εἴπερ ἔν τε καλὰ Πλάτωνα, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ διὰ τῶν ἐκγόνων τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐμμανθάνειν μόνως, ὅτε εἰκότως παρὰ τῶν θείων λογίων τὰ μαρτύρια ἐκλεγόμενοι, τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐχόμεθα ἐκδιδάσκεσθαι, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ προφητευθέντων μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ σαφηνισθέντων. p. 675.

P. 676, 678. &c.

Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ γραφῆς διδασκαλία περὶ θεοῦ λέγοντες ἀνθρωποι, καὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι. p. 697.

Ἀσθενὴς γὰρ φύσει ὁ ἀνθρώπειος λόγος, καὶ ἀδύνατος φράσαι θεόν. Id. ib.

stimonies that *Christ was the Son of God*, because the *knowledge* that came by him was so *remarkably dispersed abroad in the world*, and did prevail, notwithstanding all *opposition and persecution. For* (saith he) *the Greek Philosophy if any ordinary Magistrate forbid it did presently sink; but our doctrine hath been forbid from its first publishing, by the Kings and Potentates of the earth, who have used their utmost industry to destroy both us and that together, but still it flourisheth, and the more for its being persecuted; for it dies not like a humane doctrine, nor perisheth like a weak gift.* Thus we see that he insists on *rational evidence* as the great and sufficient testimony into which our *Faith is resolved* as to the being of a *Divine Revelation.* In his next *Book* he answers some objections of the *Heathens* against *believing Christianity*, of which the chiefest was, the *dissention* among the *Christians*, wherein (if ever) he had an opportunity to declare what the certain *rule of Faith* is, and what power *God* hath left his *Church* for determining matters to be believed by us. But for want of understanding this *necessary foundation of Faith*, viz. *the Churches Infallibility*, he is fain to answer this objection just as a *Protestant* would do. 1. *If this were an argument against truth, the objectors had none themselves, for both Jews and Greeks had heresies among them.* 2. *The very coming of heresies was an argument of the truth of Scripture, because that had expresly foretold them.* 3. *This argument doth not hold any where else, therefore it should not in reason here*, viz. *where there is any dissent there can be no certainty*; for though *Physicians differ much from one another, yet Patients are not thereby discouraged from seeking to them for cure.* 4. *This should only make Men use more care and diligence in the search and enquiry after truth; for they will find abundant recompence for their search in the pleasure of finding truth. Would any one say, because two apples are offered to him, the one a real fruit, the other made of wax, that therefore he will meddle with neither; but rather that he ought to use more care to distinguish the one from the other? If there be but one highway and many by paths which lead to precipices, rivers, or the Sea, Will he not go in the highway because there are such false ones? but rather go in it with the more care, and get the exactest knowledge of it he can. Doth a Gardener cast off the care of his Garden because weeds grow up with his herbs? or rather, doth he not use the more diligence to distinguish one from the other? So ought we to do in discerning truth.* 5. *That all those who seriously enquire after truth may receive satisfaction. For either Mans mind is capable of evidence, or it is not; if not, it is to no purpose to trouble our selves with any thing of knowledge at all; if it be, then we must descend to particular questions, by which we may demonstratively learn from the Scriptures how the heresies fell off from them; and that the most exact knowledge is preserved in truth alone, and the ancient Church.* If then *Heresies* must be demonstratively confuted out of *Scriptures*, what then doth he make to be the *rule* to judge of *Controversies*, but only *them?* For what he speaks of the *ancient Church*, he speaks of it as in conjunction with *truth*, and in opposition to those *novel Heresies* of the *Basilidians* and *Valentinians.*

Ἡ δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνθεῖ· οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἀνθρωπίνη ἀποθνήσκει διδασκαλία, οὐδ' ὡς ἀσθενὴς μαραίνεται δωρεά. p. 689.

P. 753, &c.

Ἀποδείξεως δὲ οὔσης ἀνάγκη συγκαταβαίνειν εἰς τὰς ζητήσεις, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν ἐκμανθάνειν ἀποδεικτικῶς, ὅπως μὲν ἀπεσφάλησαν αἱ αἱρέσεις, &c. p. 755.

For

For, that he doth not at all appeal to the judgement of any *Church* much less the *present*, as having any *infallibility* whereon Men ought to rely in matters of Faith, appears likewise by his following words. *But those* (saith he) *who are willing to imploy themselves in the most excellent things, will never give over the search of truth, till they have received a demonstration of it from the Scriptures themselves.* Here we see, *the last resolution of assent*, is into the *Scriptures themselves*, without any the least mention or intimation of any *Infallibility* in the *Church*, either to deliver, or interpret those *Scriptures* to us: And after, gives the true account of Heresies, *viz. Mens not adhering to the Scriptures. For* (saith he) *they must necessarily be deceived in the greatest things who undertake them, unless they hold fast the Rule of Truth, which they received from Truth it self.* And in this following discourse he goes as high as any *Protestants* whatever (even such who suppose the *Scripture* to be *principium indemonstrabile*, by any thing but it self) for he makes the *Doctrine delivered by Christ, to be the Principle of our Faith, and we make use of it* (saith he) *to be our* κριτήριον *to find out other things by. But, whatever is judged, is not believed till it be judged, therefore that can be no Principle which stands in need of being judged,. Justly therefore when we have by Faith received that indemonstrable Principle, and from the Pinciple it self used demonstrations concerning it self, we are by the voice of our Lord instructed in the knowledge of Truth.* Nothing can be more plain in what he saith, than that, if there were a higher κριτήριον than *Scripture*, (as there must be, if we are to receive it on the account of the *Churches Infallible Testimony*) the *Scripture* could not be called the *Principle of our Faith*, but when we receive the *Scripture*, the evidence we have that it is our *Principle* must be fetched *from it self*; and therefore he does here in terms (as express as may be) *resolve the belief of Scripture into internal arguments, and makes* it as much a *Principle supposed* as ever his Lordship doth. And immediately after, when he proposeth that very Question, *How this should be proved to others, We expect not* (saith he) *any proof from Men, but we prove the thing sought for by the Word of God, which is more worthy belief than any demonstration, or rather which is the only demonstration, by the knowledge of which, those who have tasted of the Scripture alone become believers.* Can any one who reads these words ever imagine, that this Man speaks like one, that said, That the *Scriptures of themselves appear no more to be God's Word, than distinction of colours to a blind Man?* How much beyond the *Valentinians* and *Basilidians* would *Clemens* have accounted so great a *madness?* who so plainly asserts the *Scriptures to be proved by themselves*, and that not *casually*, or in the *heat of argument*; But lest we should not throughly apprehend his meaning repeats it again in the same page, ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν τελείως ἀποδεικνύντες, *perfectly demonstrating the*

Ἀλλ' οἱ πονεῖν ἕτοιμοι ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις, οὐ πρότερον ἀποστήσονται ζητεῖν ἐς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πρὶν ἂν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἀπὸ τῶν λάβωσι τῶν γραφῶν. Id. ib.

Σφάλλεσθαι γὰρ ἀνάγκη μέγιστα τοῖς μεγίστοις ἐγχειροῦντας πράγμασιν, ἢν μὴ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας παρ' αὐτῆς λαβόντες ἔχωσι τῆς ἀληθείας. Id. p. 756.

Τὸ κρινόμενον δὲ πᾶν ἔτι ἄπιστον πρὶν κριθῆναι· ὥστ' οὐδ' ἀρχὴ τὸ κρίσεως δεόμενον· εἰκότως τοίνυν πίστει περιβαλόντες ἀναπόδεικτον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ περιουσίας, καὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς λαβόντες, φωνῇ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας. Strom. 7. p. 757.

Οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ πιστούμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον· ἡ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐχεγγυωτέρα, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἡ μόνη ἀπόδειξις οὖσα τυγχάνει· καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμην οἱ μὲν ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν, πιστοί. Ibid.

Scriptures by themselves. And are not all these Testimonies of such Persons so near the *Apostolical times*, sufficient to acquaint us what the *grounds* of the *Resolution of Faith* were in the *Christian Church?* When all of them do so unanimously fix on the *Scripture*, and not so much as mention the *Infallible Testimonies* of any *Church*, much less the *Roman*. Much more might be cited out of this *excellent Author* to the same purpose, particularly where he refutes the *Valentinians*, who deserted the *Scriptures*, and pleaded *Tradition*: But the Testimonies already produced are so plain, that it will be to no purpose to produce any more.

§. 7. It were easie to continue an account of the *same grounds of Faith*, through the succeeding *Writers* of the *Christian Church*, who have designedly writ on that Subject, in vindication of *Christian Religion*, which they unanimously prove to be *Divine*, chiefly by these *Arguments*; from the *undoubted Miracles* which were wrought by *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, from the *exact fulfilling of Prophecies*, and the *admirable Propagation* of the *Christian Doctrine*; all which are particularly insisted on by *Origen* against *Celsus*; by *Tertullian*, in his *Apologetick*, *adversus Scapulam*, and elsewhere; by *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, and *Lactantius*; not to mention *Eusebius* in his *Books* of *preparation* and *demonstration Evangelical*; *Cyril*'s Answer to *Julian* and others. (But, having elsewhere more fully and largely considered that subject, I rather chuse to refer the Reader to what hath been there handled already, than to tire his patience with either repeating the same, or adding more Testimonies to the same purpose.) Only that which is most pertinent to our present purpose, I shall here add, Whether it is credible that those *persons* who fully understood the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, who were themselves *rational* and *inquisitive* Men, and writ for the satisfaction not only of *subtle adversaries*, but of *doubting and staggering Christians*, should so unanimously agree in insisting on the *evidence* of *matter* of *fact*, for the *truth* of the thing delivered in *Scripture*, and the fore-mentioned *Arguments* for the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* therein delivered, had it not been the judgment of the *Church* they lived in, that the *resolution of Faith* was into those grounds on which they insisted? And is it again credible, that any of them should *believe* the *Testimony* of the *Church* to be necessary as *infallible*, in order to a *Divine Faith*, and that without it, the *Scriptures* could not be believed as *Divine*, and yet in all their *disputes* with the *Gentiles* concerning the *Doctrine* of *Christianity*, and with several *Hereticks* (as the *Marcionists*, *&c.*) concerning the *Books* of *Scripture*, upon no occasion should mention this grand *Palladium* of *Faith*, *viz.* the *Infallibility* of the *present Church?* And *lastly*, Is it credible, that when in our modern *Controversies* Men do evidently maintain *faction* and *interest*, more than the *common Principles* of *Christianity* (that he must be *blinder* than *one that can see no distinction of colours*, that doth not discern on what account this *Infallibility* is now pretended.) Is it, I say, credible, that a *Doctrine* pretended so necessary for our believing *Scriptures* with *Divine Faith*, should be so concealed; when it ought, for the *honour* and *interest* of *Christianity*, to have been most divulged? Which now only in these *last* and *worst times* is challenged by an *usurping party* in the *Church* as left by *Christ* himself (when no other evidence can be given of it, but what was common to all *ages* of the *Church*) as belonging to such a party under the pretence of the *Catholick Church*, which doth so apparently use it only to uphold her pretended *Authority*, and so makes it serve to the worst ends, and the most unworthy designs.

Origines sacræ. l. 2. c. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Having thus far considered what the judgment of those *Fathers* was concerning the *resolution of Faith*, who lived nearest the *Apostolical times*;

I should

I ſhould now come to conſider what you can produce out of *Antiquitity*, for your *Churches Infallibility*, or more generally, *for any infallible Teſtimony* ſuppoſed in the *Catholick Church* (whatever that be) in order to a Foundation for *Divine Faith*: But you very prudently avoid the *Teſtimonies* of *Antiquity* in ſo neceſſary a *ſubject* as this is; for, thoſe *Teſtimonies* mentioned in the foregoing *Chapter*, in explication of *Matth.* 28. 20. taking them, as you have in ſo looſe and careleſs a manner produced them, make nothing at all for the *Churches Infallible Teſtimony*; but only aſſert that which is not denied, that there ſhall always be a *Chriſtian Church* in the world. Our only remaining task then, as to this, is, to examine in what way you ſeek to enervate the Teſtimonies produced by his Lordſhip out of *Antiquity*, which you do in the latter part of *Chap.* 8. His Lordſhip had truly ſaid, *That this me-* P. 10. n. 32.
thod and manner of proving the Scripture to be the Word of God, which he uſeth, is the ſame which the ancient Church ever held, namely Tradition, or Eccleſiaſtical Authority firſt, and then all other arguments, but eſpecially internal from the Scripture it ſelf. For which he cites, firſt, *The Church in S.* Auguſtine's *time. He was no enemy to Church-Tradition* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *yet when he would prove that the Author of the Scripture (and ſo of the whole knowledge of Divinity, as it is ſupernatural) is God in Chriſt, he takes this as the all-ſufficient way, and gives four proofs all internal to the Scripture.* 1. *the Miracles.* 2. *That there is nothing carnal in the Doctrine.* 3. *That there hath been ſuch performance of it.* 4. *That by ſuch a Doctrine of Humility, the whole world almoſt hath been converted. And whereas* ad muniendam fidem, *for the defending of the Faith, and keeping it entire, there are two things requiſite, Scripture and Church-Tradition*; Vincent. Lirinenſ. *places authority of Scriptures firſt, and then Tradition. And ſince it is apparent, that Tradition is firſt in order of time, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that Scripture is firſt in order of nature, that is the chief upon which Faith reſts and reſolves it ſelf.* To this (after you have needleſly explained his Lordſhips opinion in this Controverſie) you begin to anſwer thus; *He cites firſt* Vincentius Lirinenſis, P. 108
l. 1. *c.* 1. *who makes our Faith to be confirmed both by Scripture and Tradition of the Catholick Church.* But, Are not you like to be truſted in citing *Fathers* who doubly falſifie a Teſtimony of your adverſaries, when you may be ſo eaſily diſproved? For 1. You tell us, he cites that *firſt*, which he produceth *laſt*. 2. You cite that as produced by him for the *Foundation of Faith*, which he expreſly cites for the *preſervation* of the *Doctrine* of *Faith*; ſo he tells you *ad muniendam fidem, &c.* Can any thing be more plain and obvious to any one who looks into that diſcourſe of *Vincentius*, than that he makes it not his buſineſs to give an account of the *general Foundations* of Faith as to the *Scriptures* being *Gods Word*, but of the particular *Doctrines* of *Faith*, in oppoſition to the *Hereſies* which ariſe in the *Church*. So that all that he ſpeaks concerning *Scripture*, is not about the *authority*, but the *ſenſe* and *interpretation* of it. If therefore I ſhould grant you, that he ſpeaks of *Chriſtian* and *Divine Faith*, What is this to your purpoſe, unleſs you could prove that he ſpeaks of that *Divine Faith*, whereby we believe the *Scripture to be the Word of God.* But yet your argument is very good to prove, *that he ſpeaks not of any humane fallible perſwaſion, but true Chriſtian Divine Faith; for he oppoſes it to Hereſie, and calls it ſound Faith, and his Faith.* It ſeems then, whatever *Faith* is *ſound* for the *matter* of it, is preſently *Chriſtian, Divine and Infallible*; and ſo, whoſoever believes any thing which is materially *true*, in oppoſition to *Hereſies*, needs never fear as long as he doth ſo, for according to you he hath

hath *Chriſtian and Infallible Faith*; but what if the *Devils Faith* be as *ſound* as any *Catholick's*, Muſt it therefore be *Divine Faith? No* (it may be you will anſwer) *becauſe he wants the formal object of Faith, and doth not believe on the account of your Churches Infallibility*; I verily believe you; for he knows the *juglings* of it too much to believe it *infallible*. But, take *Vincentius* in what ſenſe you pleaſe, that is evident in him which his Lordſhip produced him for, that, *for the preſerving Faith entire*, he places authority of *Scripture* firſt, and then *Tradition* (unleſs you will ſerve his Teſtimony, as you do his Lordſhips, becauſe it makes for your purpoſe, ſay, He mentions *Tradition firſt*, and then *Scripture*) but, ſay you, *He ſays Tradition doth as truly confirm Divine Faith, as Scripture, though Scripture doth it in a higher manner.* If you did but conſider, either what kind of *Tradition*, or what kind of *Faith Vincentius* inſiſts on, you could not poſſibly think his words any thing to your purpoſe. For he ſpeaks not of any *Tradition Infallibly atteſted* to us, without which you pretend there can be no *Divine Faith*, but of ſuch an *Univerſal Tradition* which depends wholly upon *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent*, and never ſo much as mentions, much leſs pretends to any thing of *Infallibility*: So that if you grant ſuch a kind of *Tradition*, doth as truly confirm *Faith* as the *Scripture*, then you muſt grant no neceſſity of an *Infallible Teſtimony* to aſſure us of that *Tradition*, for *Vincentius* ſpeaks of ſuch a kind of *Tradition*, as hath no connexion with *Infallibility*. For if *Vincentius* had ever in the leaſt thought of any ſuch thing, ſo great and zealous an oppoſer of *Hereſies* would not have left out that which had been more to his purpoſe, than all that he had ſaid. For wiſe Men, who have throughly conſidered of *Vincentius* his way, though in general they cannot but approve of it ſo far as to think it highly improbable, that there ſhould be *Antiquity*, *Univerſality*, and *Conſent* againſt the true and genuine ſenſe of *Scripture*, yet when they conſider this way of *Vincentius*, with all thoſe *cautions*, *reſtrictions*: and *limitations* ſet down by him (*l.* 1. *c.* 39.) they are apt to think, that he hath put Men to a *wild-gooſe-chaſe* to find out any thing according to his Rules; and that S. *Auguſtine* ſpake a great deal more to the purpoſe, when he ſpake concerning all the *Writers of the Church*; *That although they had never ſo much learning and ſanctity, he did not think it true, becauſe they thought ſo, but becauſe they perſwaded him to believe it true, either from the Authority of Scripture, or ſome probable Reaſon.* If therefore S. *Auſtin's* Authority be not ſunk ſo low as that of the *Monk* of *Lerins*, we have very little reaſon to think that *Tradition* can as truly confirm Faith to us as the *Scriptures*, ſuppoſing that to have been the meaning of *Vincentius*. Which yet is not reaſonable to imagine, ſince *Vincentius himſelf* grants, that in caſe of *inveterate Hereſie* or *Schiſm*, either the ſole *Authority* of *Scripture* is to be uſed, or at moſt the *determinations* of *General Councils*; nay, and in all caſes doth ſuppoſe, that the *Canon of Scripture is perfect, and is abundantly ſufficient of it ſelf for all things.* Can you yet therefore ſuppoſe, *that Vincentius did think that Tradition did as truly confirm our Faith as the Scripture?* Which is your aſſertion, and the only thing whereby you pretend *that the Biſhop hath miſconſtrued* Vincentius; but whether be more guilty of it, I leave to impartial judgement.

Alios autem ita lego, ut quantâlibet ſanctitate, doctrinâ q; præpolleant, non ideò verum putem, quòd ipſi ita ſenſerunt, ſed quia mihi, vel per illos authores Canonicos, vel probabili ratione, quod à vero non abhorreat, perſuadere potuerunt. Auguſt. ep. 19.

Lib. 1. c. 39.

Quum ſit perfectus Scripturarum Canon, ſibiq; ad omnia ſatis ſuperq; ſufficiat, &c. l. 1. c. 2.

§. 9. The next Teſtimony you conſider, is, that of *Henricus à Gandavo*. For his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That the School had confeſſed, this was the way ever.* For which

which he cites the Teſtimony of that *Schoolman*, *That daily with them that are without, Chriſt enters by the woman* i. e. *the Church, and they believe by that fame which ſhe gives* (alluding to the ſtory of the woman of *Samaria.*) *But when they come to hear Chriſt himſelf, they believe His words* before the words of the woman: *For when they have once found Chriſt, they do more believe his words in Scripture, than they do the Church, which teſtifies of him; becauſe then* propter illam, *for the Scripture they believe the Church. And if the Church ſhould ſpeak contrary to the Scripture, they would not believe it. Thus* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *the School taught them. No, that did it not* (ſay you.) But let us ſee, how rarely you prove it: *For* (you ſay) *he ſpeaks all this of a ſupernatural and Divine Faith to be given, both to the Scriptures, and the Church.* *Gandavenſis* certainly is much obliged to you, who venture to ſpeak ſuch *great Abſurdities* for his ſake; for if he be underſtood in both places of *Divine* and *Infallible Faith*, theſe rare conſequences follow. 1. That the *firſt beginning* of *Faith* is *equal* to the higheſt *degree* of it; for when he ſpeaks of the *Church*, he ſpeaks of *Chriſt's entring by that*, which can be meant of nothing elſe but the *firſt ſtep to Faith*, as is plain in the parallel caſe of the Woman of *Samaria*; but if this were *Divine and Infallible*, it muſt be *equal* to the higheſt *degree*, for that I ſuppoſe can *be but Divine and Infallible*, unleſs you can find out *degrees* in *Infallibility*. By this Rule, you make him that is but over the *threſhold* as much in *the houſe*, as he that is *ſate down* to the *Table*; a *plant* at its firſt *peeping* out of the earth, to be as *tall* as at its full growth; and the *Samaritans* as firmly to *believe* in Chriſt at the firſt *mention* of him by the *Woman*, as when they ſaw and heard him. 2. By this you make an *Infallible Faith* to be built on a *Fallible Teſtimony*; for to what purpoſe elſe was the Similitude of the *Woman* of *Samaria* inſiſted on, but to parallel the Teſtimony of the *Church* with that of the *Woman*, and conſequently the *Faith* built on the *Churches* Teſtimony to be like that which the *Samaritans* had of *Chriſt* upon the *Womans Teſtimony*; and if you believe that *Faith Infallible*, you muſt aſſert, an *Infallible Faith* to be built on a *fallible Teſtimony*, and yet to be as *infallible*, as that which is built on an *Infallible Teſtimony*. And then, I pray, tell me, To what end would you make your *Churches Teſtimony Infallible*, if *Faith* may be *infallible* without it?

Sic quotidie apud illos qui foris ſunt intrat Chriſtus per mulierem, in Eccleſiam, & credunt per iſtam famam, &c. Hen. à Gand. ſum. p. 1. *A.* 10. q. 1.

Plus verbis Chriſti in Scripturâ credit, quam Eccleſiæ teſtificanti: quia propter illam jam credit Eccleſiæ. Et, ſi ipſa quidem contraria Scripturæ diceret, ipſe non crederet. Id.

But, it may be, though theſe ſeem hard things, yet you prove them invincibly: No doubt of it; for, you ſay, *That Chriſt enters by that Faith, but Chriſt cannot enter into a ſoul by a meer humane fallible perſwaſion, but by Divine Faith only. Nay, when he ſays, That he more believes the Scripture, than the Churches Teſtimony, he ſaith, That he believes the Church; But how can he believe without Faith?* O the irreſiſtible force of demonſtrations! But what ſilly people are we, that thought a Man might *enter* into a *houſe* by the *door*, tho' he met not with his hearty entertainment till afterwards? But, Do you really think, that *Chriſt* never *enters* into a *ſoul*, but by *Divine and Infallible Faith?* For *Chriſt enters* by that which gives him his *firſt admiſſion*, but his *full reception* muſt be by a higher *degree* of *Faith*. Do you think Men believe as much at *firſt* as ever after? If not, May not *Chriſt* be ſaid to *enter* by that *lower degree of Faith?* I pray, What think you of the *caſe* in hand, Did not the belief of *Chriſt enter* by the *Woman* of *Samaria?* and was that, as *Divine a Faith*, as what they had afterwards? Nay, take *Chriſts entring* (as improperly as you can imagine it) for his *hearty reception* in the ſoul; Can that be no other ways but by an *Infallible Faith?*

P. 103.

A *Faith*

A *Faith* ſuppoſed to be built on *infallible grounds*, I grant; but whether all, who do truly *believe* in *Chriſt*, do build their *Faith* on *grounds in themſelves infallible*, my charity to ſome deluded ſouls in your *Church* (as well as honeſt, but ignorant perſons elſewhere) gives me juſt *reaſon* to queſtion. But ſtill there is a greater ſubtilty behind, which is, if he believes the *Scripture* more than the *Church*, then he muſt believe the *Church* equally with the *Scripture*; for that muſt be the meaning of what you ſay, *when he ſays, He believes the Scripture more than the Church, he believes the Church; but how can he believe without Faith? Ergo*, this muſt be Divine Faith, or elſe all the reſt comes to nothing. So that if I ſay, *I believe the Scripture more than you*, it follows, that *I believe you as much as the Scripture*, by the very ſame conſequence. But you have gotten ſuch a knack of contradicting your ſelf, that poor *Gandavo* cannot fall into your hands, but you muſt make him do ſo too. When you ſay, *A Man cannot believe without Faith*, I dare juſtifie it to be one of the greateſt truths in your Book; but, if your meaning be, *A Man cannot believe without Divine Faith*, I hope we *Proteſtants* ſufficiently confute that; for you dare not deny that *we believe at all*, but (juſt as the *Devils* do) we muſt (according to you) *believe and tremble*, becauſe our Faith is not *Divine* and *Infallible*. But ſtill your ſubtilty works with you, for becauſe *Ganvadenſis* ſaith, *That we muſt yield our firſt Faith to the Scripture, but* ſecundam ſub iſta, *a ſecondary Faith to the definitions and cuſtoms of the Catholick Church:* You cry out, *Here's* prima & ſecunda fides; *but yet both of them are properly and truly Faith.* But, Are both of them properly and truly *Divine Faith?* if ſo, How comes the diſtinction of the *firſt and ſecond*, one ſubordinate to the other, if both be *equally Divine and Infallible?* Nay, according to your Principles, the Faith given to the *Church* muſt be the *firſt Faith*, and to the *Scriptures the ſecond* under that; becauſe, for the ſake of the *Churches Teſtimony*, we are to believe the *Scriptures*. And, Do you really think, there may be no diſcovery of *Infidelity* in rejecting a *ſufficient Teſtimony* for *Faith*, where there is not an *Infallible Teſtimony?* But, whatever you think, your great enemy, *Reaſon*, tells us the contrary; and therefore what follows *of believing the Church, ſub pœnâ perfidiæ*, is to no more purpoſe than what went before. The ſtrength therefore of all that you ſay as to this Teſtimony of *Gandavenſis*, lies in the proof of this one thing; *That no Man can believe any thing without an Infallible Faith*; yet I *verily believe* that you have miſerably perverted the *Schoolmens* words, and think no more *Infallible Teſtimony* requiſite for it, than your *own words*.

§. 10. P. 109. But, it may be, though yo do ſo ill by the *Schoolmen*, you may uſe the *Fathers* more civily. Three things therefore you have to anſwer to thoſe Teſtimonies of the *Fathers*, which ſeem moſt to make uſe of internal Arguments. 1. *That they uſe them not to ſuch as had no Divine Faith, but to ſuch as had.* 2. *That they do not uſe them as Primary, Infallible and Divine proofs, but as ſecondary arguments, perſuaſive only to ſuch as believed Scripture to be Gods Word antecedently to them.* 3. *That they do not uſe only ſuch proofs as are wholly internal to the Scripture it ſelf. As to the two firſt conditions, you ſay 'tis evident, theſe proofs were made by Chriſtians, namely the Holy Fathers; and commonly to Chriſtians, who lived in their times. And as clear is it, that they never pronounced them to be the Primary, Infallible and Divine Motives of their belief in that point, nor uſed they them as ſuch.* How falſe and abſurd thoſe Anſwers are, may appear by our precedent diſcourſe, wherein we manifeſted, that the *Chriſtians* inſiſted on thoſe *arguments* there mentioned not *for themſelves* and other *Chriſtians*, but chiefly to convince and perſwade

by

by them the *Gentile world* to the belief of *Chriſtianity*. And, Did they ſuppoſe theſe *Heathens* to have a *Divine Faith* already? Or, did they look on ſuch arguments as only *ſecondary motives*, when theſe were the *chief*, nay only *arguments* which they uſed to perſwade them; if they had other that were *Primary*, *Divine*, and *Infallible*, and only made uſe of *ſecondary*, *humane*, *probable motives*, they were guilty of the higheſt *betraying* the *Chriſtian Cauſe* imaginable. And you make them only to *defend Chriſtianity*, as *Vaninus* did *Divine Providence* with ſuch ſilly and weak arguments, that by their overthrow, the belief of it might fall with them. Indeed, if they had pretended the *Infallible Teſtimony* of the *Church*, there might have been juſt reaſon for ſuch a *Suſpicion*, and any wiſe Men would have thought their deſign had been to make their Religion contemptible, and expoſe it to the deriſion of *Atheiſts*, inſtead of better eſtabliſhing the *Foundations* of believing it. But thoſe wiſe and holy Men knew better the *intereſt* of *Chriſtianity*, than to offer to defend it by *Principles* in themſelves falſe, and much more liable to queſtion than that was which they were to prove by them: and therefore made choice of arguments in themſelves *ſtrong* and *evident*, and built on *Principles*, *common to themſelves*, *and thoſe whom they diſputed againſt*, *i. e.* they urged them with the greateſt ſtrength of *Reaſon*, and the cleareſt *evidence* of *Divine Revelation*, and never queſtioned but that a *Faith* built on thoſe *grounds*, if effectual for a *holy Life*, was a *true* and *Divine Faith*. It ſeems then, your cauſe cannot be maintained, without the moſt ſharp and virulent reflections on thoſe *Primitive Chriſtians*, who among all thoſe arguments whereby they ſo ſucceſsfully prevailed over the *Gentile world*, never did ſo much as vouchſafe to mention the leaſt pretence to *Infallibility*; for which they are now accuſed of uſing only the *blunter weapons* of *humane and fallible motives*, and not thoſe *Primary* and *Divine Motives of Infallibility*. But this is not the firſt time we have ſeen, what deſperate ſhifts a bad cauſe puts Men upon.

It may be yet, your ſtrength may lye in your *laſt condition*, *viz. That theſe arguments uſed by them*, *were not internal*. For, 1. You ſay, *That of Miracles is external*; *the Scriptures themſelves work none*, *neither were ever any Miracles wrought to confirm*, *that all the Books now in the Canon* (*and no more*) *are the Word of God*. I anſwer, 1. I have already told you of a double reſolution of *Faith*, the one as to the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine*, the other as to the *Veracity* of the *Books* which contain it: when therefore *Miracles* are inſiſted on, it is not in order to the *latter* of theſe which we have ſufficient aſſurance of without them, as I have already largely proved, both as to the *Truth* and *Integrity* of the *Canon* of *Scripture*; but *Miracles*, we ſay, are the arguments to prove the *Divinity* of the *Doctrine* by, becauſe they atteſt the *Divine Revelation* of the perſons, who deliver this Doctrine to the world. 2. As *to us*, who receive the report of thoſe *Miracles*, as conveyed to us by the *Scripture*, thoſe may be ſaid to be *internal arguments* to the *Scripture*, which are there recorded in order to our believing the *Doctrine* therein contained to be *Divine*. The *Motives* of *Faith* being delivered to us now joyntly with the *Doctrine*, although on different *grounds*, we believe the *Veracity* of the *Books* of *Scripture*, and the *Infallibility* of the *Doctrine* contained in it. We believe that the *Miracles* were truly done, becauſe they are delivered to us by an unqueſtionable Tradition, in ſuch *Authentick Writings* as the *Scriptures* are; but we believe the *Doctrine* contained in the Books to be *Divine*, becauſe atteſted by ſuch *Miracles*, and we believe the Books of *Scripture* to be *divinely inſpired*, becauſe ſuch perſons cannot be ſuppoſed to *falſifie* to the world who

wrought ſuch *great Miracles*. 2. You ſay, *The converſion of ſo many People and Nations by the Doctrine contained in Scripture, is alſo external to the Scripture.* But ſtill you ſuppoſe that theſe arguments are brought to prove theſe *Books* to be *divinely inſpired*, which is denied; we ſay only That the *admirable propagation of the Doctrine of the Goſpel*, is a great argument that it was from *God*. And therefore, when afterwards you ſay, *That ſuppoſing all thoſe arguments mentioned by the Biſhop out of S.* Auguſtine, *to be internal to the Scripture, yet they cannot infallibly and divinely prove that Scripture is the Word of God.* If by *Scripture*, you mean the *Writings*, we pretend not to it; if by *Scripture*, you mean the *Doctrine* of it, we aſſert it, and think it no argument at all againſt that, which you add, *That perſwade they may, but convince they cannot*; no doubt if they *perſwade*, they do much more than *convince*; But, I ſuppoſe, your meaning is, they do it not *effectually*; if ſo, that is not the fault of the *arguments*, but of the *perſon*, who by his *obſtinacy*, will not hearken to the *cleareſt evidence* of *Reaſon*. All that this can prove, is a neceſſity of *Divine Grace* to go along with *external evidence*, which you dare not aſſert, for fear of running into that *private Spirit*, which you objected to his Lordſhip on the ſame account. But it is very pretty which follows: You ſay, *Suppoſing*
P. 110. *that all thoſe arguments mentioned, of Miracles, nothing carnal in the Doctrine, performance of it, and converſion of the world by it, were all of them internal to Scripture, yet they could not prove infallibly the Scripture to be the Word of God*; and to prove this, you tell us, *concerning the third and fourth, How can it ever be proved, that either the performance of this Doctrine, or the converſion of nations is internal to Scripture?* But, Did you not ſuppoſe them before to be internal to *Scripture*? and though they were ſo, yet could not prove the *Scripture*, *&c?* and to prove that, you ſay they cannot be proved *internal to Scripture.* Which is juſt as if I ſhould ſay if you were *Pope* you would not be *Infallible*; and all the evidence I ſhould give for it, ſhould be only to prove that you were not *Pope.*

You conclude this *Chapter* with a *Wonder* (I mean not any thing of *Reaſon* which would really be ſo) *But*, ſay you, *who can ſufficiently wonder, that his Lordſhip, for theſe four Motives, ſhould ſo eaſily make the Scripture give Divine Teſtimony to it ſelf, upon which our Faith muſt reſt, and yet deny the ſame priviledge to the Church? Seeing it cannot be denied, but that every one of theſe Motives are much more immediately and clearly applied to the Church, than to the Scripture.* What? more immediately and clearly; and ſo clearly, that it cannot be denied? Prove but any one of them as to that *Church*, whoſe Infallibility is in queſtion, *viz.* the *preſent Roman-Church*, and I will yield you the reſt. Produce but any one *undoubted Miracle*, to confirm the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, or the *Paſtors* of it, ſhew your *Doctrine* (wherein it differs from ours) not to be *carnal*, manifeſt the *performance* of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, only in the *members* of your *Church*, prove that it is *your Church, as ſuch*, which hath preached *this Doctrine*, and *converted whole nations to the belief of it* (in any other way than the *Spaniards* did the poor *Indians*) and we may begin to hearken with ſomewhat more patience to your arrogant and unreaſonable pretence of *Infallibility.* Can any one then who hath any grain of reaſon left him, think that from theſe arguments, *while his Lordſhip diſputes moſt eagerly againſt the preſent Churches Infallibility, he argues mainly for it*, as you very wiſely conclude that Chapter? If this be arguing for your *Churches Infallibility*, much good may ſuch arguments do you.

And

And ſo I come to the laſt part of my task as to this Controverſie, which is, to examine your next Chapter, which puts us in hopes of ſeeing an End of this *tedious Controverſie:* But this containing very little new in it (and therefore deſerves not to be handled apart) will on that account admit of a quicker diſpatch. In which the firſt *Section* begins with S. *Auſtin's Teſtimony*, which ſhould have been conſidered before, and now it comes out with the ſame Anſwer attending it, which was given ſo lately concerning *primary and infallible, and ſecondary and probable Motives of Faith*, the vanity of which is ſufficiently diſcovered. Whereas in your *Margent* you bring an example of ſuch a *probable Motive*, viz. *when* S. Auſtin *ſaith to* Fauſtus. *That as conſtant Tradition was ſufficient for him to believe that that Epiſtle was* Manichæus *his, which went under his name; ſo the ſame Tradition was ſufficient to him to prove the Goſpel was* S. Matthew's, *which was ſo univerſally received for his, ever ſince the writing of it.* I am ſo far from thinking this a meer *probable Motive*, that it is the higheſt *evidence* the *matter* is capable of, and ſo S. *Auſtin* thought. Your paralleling the ſaying of *Waldenſis* (*That if the Church ſhould ſpeak any thing contrary to Scripture, he would not believe her*) with another which you pretend to be S. *Auſtin's; If the Scripture ſhould ſpeak any thing contrary to the Church, we could not believe that neither; and then ſaying that both proceed on an impoſſible ſuppoſition*, muſt imply, that it is an equal impoſſibility for the *Church* to deliver any thing *contrary* to the *Doctrine* of *Scripture*, as for the *Scripture* to *contradict* it ſelf; for to ſay, The *Scripture* ſhould contradict the *Church*, ſignifies nothing, becauſe the Being of the *Church* is founded on the *Doctrine* of Scripture. All that S. *Auſtin* ſaith, in the place you refer us to, comes to no more than this, If the *Church* were found deceived in the *Writings of Scripture*, then there could be no ground of any *firm aſſent* to them. And, is this, I pray, a fit parallel for that *ſpeech of Waldenſis?* Is this to ſay, If the *Scripture ſpeak any thing againſt the Church, it is not to be believed?*

§. 11. P. 111. *Aug. c. Fauſt. l. 28. c. 2.*

In your next *Sect. N.* 2, 3. you fall from *Parallels*, to *Circles*, and *Semi-circles* (as you call them) in which you only ſhew us your faculty of *mumbling the ſame things over and over*, concerning his Lordſhips *miſtaking the Queſtion, about Infallible and Divine Faith, Apoſtolical Tradition, the formal Object of Faith*, which I muſt, out of charity to the Readers patience, beg him to look back for the ſeveral Anſwers, if he thinks any thing needs it; for I am now quite tired with theſe *Repetitions*, there being not one word added here, but what hath been anſwered already. But, leſt theſe ſhould not enough tire us, the next *Sect. N.* 4. conſiſts of the old *puff paſt* of *ultimate Motive, and formal Object, of the Infallibility which is not ſimply Divine*, and others of a like nature, whoſe vanity hath been detected in the very entrance into this Controverſie.

P. 111, 112. P. 113.

It ſeems you had a great mind to give *the Biſhop a blow*, when you reach as far, as from *p.* 103. to *p.* 115, to do it, and yet fall ſhort of it at laſt; for, tho' you charge him with a falſe citation of S. *Auſtin*, for theſe words, *fidei ultima reſolutio eſt in Deum illuminantem*, yet in that Chapter, tho' not the words, yet the *ſenſe* is there extant, when he gives that account of *Chriſtian Faith, That it comes not by the authority of Men, but from God himſelf confirming and enlightning our mind.* Is not here a plain reſolution of Faith *in Deum illuminantem?* And therefore your charge of *falſe citation*, and your confident denial, *That there is any ſuch Text to be found either there, or any where elſe in all* S. Auguſtine, argue, you are not careful what you ſay, ſo you may but throw *dirt* in your adverſaries *face*, though

Non jam hominibus, ſed ipſo Deo intrinſecus mentem noſtram firmante & illuminante. Aug. c. ep. Manich. c. 14.

eaſily know from whence it comes, by the *foulneſs* of your *fingers*. And for your other challenge, *of producing any Teſtimony of the Fathers which ſaith, That we muſt reſolve our Faith of Scripture into the Light of Scripture*; I hope the Teſtimonies I have in this Chapter mentioned, may teach you a little more *modeſty*: and for the other part of it, *That we cannot believe the Scripture infallibly for the Churches authority*, as far as a *Negative* can be proved, I dare appeal to the judgement of any *one*, Whether it be *poſſible* to *believe* that the *Fathers* judged, the *Certainty*, much leſs *Infallibility* of *Chriſtian Faith* did depend on the *Churches Infallible Teſtimony*, and yet never upon the moſt juſt occaſion do ſo much as mention it, but rather ſpeak very much to the contrary.

§. 12. His Lordſhip having thus at large delivered his mind in this important Controverſie; to make what he had ſaid the more *portable*, ſums up the ſubſtance of it in ſeveral *Conſiderations*. Which being only a *recapitulation* of what had been fully diſcuſſed already, will need the ſhorter *Vindication*, in ſome *brief ſtructures*, where you unjuſtly quarrel with them. To his 1. *That it ſeems reaſonable, that ſince all Sciences ſuppoſe Principles, Theology ſhould be allowed ſome too: the chiefeſt of which is, That the Scriptures*
P. 114. *are of Divine Authority*; your Anſwer is conſiderable; *viz. that he confounds Theology, a diſcurſive Science, with Faith, which is an act of the Underſtanding, produced by an Impulſe of the Will*, &c. But not to examine what hath been already handled, of the power of the *Will in the act of Faith*, it is plain when his Lordſhip ſpeaks of *Theology*, he means *Theology*, and not *Faith*; and the intent of this Conſideration was to ſhew, the *unreaſonableneſs of ſtarting this Queſtion in a Theological Diſpute about the Church*. In your Anſwer to the *ſecond*, you ſay, *That Fallible Motives cannot produce Certainty*, which if you would prove, you would do more to the purpoſe than you have done yet, and by this argument, I could not be *certain*, whether *you had done it or no*, unleſs you brought ſome *Infallible Motives* to prove it. The third you paſs over. The fourth you grant, though not very *conſiſtently*
P. 115. with what you elſewhere ſay: As to what you ſay in anſwer to the fifth, *concerning Miracles*, I agree with you in it, having elſewhere ſufficiently declared my ſelf as to them. For the ſixth you refer to your former Anſwer, and ſo do I to the reply to it. In the ſeventh, his *Lordſhip* proves *the neceſſity of ſome revelation from God* rationally and ſtrongly, and thence infers, *That either there never was any ſuch Revelation, or that the Scripture is that Revelation, and that's it we Chriſtians labour to make good againſt all Atheiſm,*
P. 116. *Prophaneneſs, and Infidelity*. To which you have two Exceptions. 1. *That this cannot be proved by the meer Light of Scripture*, which His Lordſhip never pretended to. 2. *That he leaves out the Word*, only, *which was the cauſe of the whole Controverſie*; What, between *Chriſtians* and *Atheiſts?* For of that Controverſie, he there ſpeaks; but ſince you are ſo fond of your *unwritten Revelations*, pray prove the *neceſſity* of them as ſtrongly againſt *Atheiſts*, as his *Lordſhip* hath done the *neceſſity* of a *written one*. In the *laſt Conſideration* he muſters up all the ſeveral *arguments* whereby Men may be perſwaded, *That this Revelation is contained in thoſe Books we call the Scripture*; as the *Tradition* of the *Church*, the *Teſtimony of former Ages*, the *conſent of times*, the *Harmony of Prophets*, and *the Propheſies fulfilled*, the *ſucceſs of the Doctrine*, the *conſtancy of it*, the *ſpiritual nature and efficacy of it*, and laſtly, the *inward light and excellency of the Text it ſelf*; which, with a great deal of *Rhetorick*, is there ſet forth. But to all this you ſay no more than what hath been abundantly diſproved, *viz. That all theſe only juſtifie our belief, when it is received as the ancients received it, upon the Infallible*

Authority

Authority of Church Tradition, but never otherwiſe. Whereas we have proved, that the *ancients* received it only on the ſame *grounds*, which are here mentioned, and therefore certainly are *ſufficient* not only to *juſtifie* our *Faith*, but to perſwade us to *believe*.

Your argument againſt what his *Lordſhip* ſaith of the *neceſſity of the Spirit's aſſiſtance with theſe Motives, and the Light of Scripture for producing Divine Faith*, will equally hold againſt all thoſe of your own ſide, who hold the *neceſſity of God's Spirit for believing the Churches Infallibility*, and againſt all ſuch of both ſides, *who hold any neceſſity of Divine Grace*, for then you muſt ſay, that either that *Grace* is not neceſſary in order to *ſalvation*, or *that thoſe who want it, are neither truly Chriſtians, nor capable of ſalvation.* And *how horridly ſoever theſe conſequences ſound in the ears of the unlearned*, they can ſound no worſe than thoſe *multitudes* of *Scriptures* do which tell Men, That *without true Divine Faith, and real Grace, they are under eternal condemnation.* But, it may be, that the *unlearned* may not be affrighted with ſuch *ſentences* as thoſe are, you think it a great deal better to let them hear little or nothing of the *Scripture*, and to let them be continually entertained with the *ſweet* and *melodious voice of the Church.* No doubt, you thought, your next argument had done the buſineſs effectually; *For* (ſay you) *to make them more ſenſible of the foulneſs of this errour, viz.* the danger of ſuch who do not ſavingly believe, *Let them conſider, that when young and unlearned Chriſtians are taught to ſay their Creed, and profeſs their belief of the Articles contained in it, before they read Scripture, they are taught to lye, and profeſs to do that, which they neither do, nor can do in his Tenet.* An excellent argument againſt making *Children* ſay their *Creed!* but, Will not the ſame hold againſt all publick uſing of the *Creed*, becauſe it is unqueſtionable but there are ſome who do not *ſavingly* or *divinely* believe it? Nay, Will it not much more hold againſt any in your *Church*, ſaying their *Creed* at all, unleſs they firſt believe your *Church* to be *Infallible*, which is very well known that all do not. For then, according to *you, they do but lye, and profeſs to do that which they neither do, nor can do, without the Churches Infallible Teſtimony:* And therefore you muſt begin a new work of *Catechiſing* the *members* of your *Church*, to know whether they believe the *Churches Infallibility*, before they can ſay their *Creed.* Unleſs you ſolve it among your ſelves, by ſaying, It is not a *formal lye*, but only an *æquivocation*, which many of you ſay, is *lawful* in caſe of *danger*, as you ſee apparently this is. But if the *æquivocation* be ſaid only to lye in the word *Believe*; you might eaſily diſcern the *weakneſs* of your *argument*, through it. For if ſome may *truly believe* what they do not *ſavingly believe*, there is *no lye* certainly told, in *ſaying*, They do *believe* as far as they do; which is by a *firm aſſent* to the *Truth* of all the *Articles of Faith*, by that which is call'd an *hiſtorical*, or *dogmatical Faith*, where there may be no *ſaving Faith.* But that becauſe *Children are taught* (as a ſhort *ſyſteme* of the *Articles* of *Faith*) *to ſay their* Creed, *we muſt be convinced of the foulneſs of our errour*, is an apparent evidence, that either you apprehended our *underſtandings* to be *very weak*, or that you ſufficiently *diſcover* your *own* to be *ſo.* §. 13. P. 116.

The only quarrel which you have with his *Lordſhip's* Synthetical way is, *That he confounds his Reader with multiplicity of arguments, and weakens the authority of the Church, without which* (if you may be believed) *he might tire himſelf and others, but never be able to make a clear reſolution of Faith.* How clear an account you have given of *Faith* in your *Analytical way*, by the *Authority of the Church*, hath been ſufficiently laid open to you; but I wonder not that you quarrel with *multiplicity of arguments*, there being nothing §. 14. P. 117. n. 7.

which

which doth really weaken the *authority of your Church* ſo much as *they* do, and they are Men certainly of your *temper*, who will *be ſoon tired with too much reaſon*. What follows concerning the *captiouſneſs of the Queſtion* as firſt propounded, and the *vicious Circle* you would free your ſelves of, by the *Motives of Credibility*; deſerve no further anſwer. Only when you would make *A. C. go your way*, and *both together prove the Church Infallible independently on Scripture*, you did not certainly conſider, that it is an *Infallibility by Promiſe*, which you challenge, and, for that end, in the precedent *Chapter*, were thoſe *places of Scripture* produced by *A. C.* and urged by you All that I ſhall return by way of *Anſwer* to your tedious diſcourſe concerning *Scriptures being a Principle ſuppoſed among Chriſtians* (the main of it depending on the circumſtances of the diſpute between his Lordſhip and Mr. *Fiſher*) ſhall be in theſe following particulars. 1. That in all Controverſies among *Chriſtians*, whoſe deciſion depends upon the *authority of Scripture*, the *Scripture* muſt be ſuppoſed as granted to be of *Divine Authority* by both *parties*. 2. That in that *Queſtion*, *whether the Scripture contains all neceſſary things of Faith*, that *neceſſity* muſt be ſuppoſed to relate to the *things* which depend upon *Scripture*, and therefore implies it believed on other grounds, that this *Scripture* is of *Divine Revelation*. For the Queſtion is, whether *God* hath conſigned his will ſo fully to us, in this *Revelation* of himſelf, that nothing neceſſary to be believed is left out of it? For Men then to ſay, That this is *left out of it*, viz. *to believe that this is a Divine Revelation*, is an unreaſonable Cavil, it being ſuppoſed in the very *Queſtion*, that it is ſo. 3. That in this ſenſe the *Scripture* may be ſaid to be a *ſuppoſed Principle*, becauſe it hath a different way of *probation*, from *particular Objects of Faith* revealed in *Scripture*. For to a *rational Enquirer*, who ſeems to doubt of the Truth of *Scriptures*, it is equally abſurd to give him any one of theſe three Anſwers. 1. *That it is a Principle to be ſuppoſed*: for, though it be ſuppoſed as to the particular debate depending on *Scripture*; yet it is fond and abſurd to ſay, It muſt be *ſuppoſed* when it is the *thing* in queſtion. 2. *That it is known meerly by its own Light*: for the perſon I have to deal with, ſuppoſing himſelf equally capable to judge of *Reaſon* and *Evidence*, as my ſelf, it doth but betray the *weakneſs* of my *cauſe*, or my *inability* to manage it, to pretend that to be *evident*, which it is much more *evident*, that he doth not think ſo; and it is only to tell him, my *Underſtanding* muſt rule *his*, and that whatever appears to me to have *Light* in it ſelf, ought likewiſe *ſo* to appear to him. 3. It is as abſurd as either of the other two, to ſay, *That you will prove to a rational Enquirer, the Scripture to be God's Word, by an unwritten Word of God*. For, 1. His Enquiry is, Whether there be *any Word of God or no*, you prove *there is, becauſe there is*, for that is all you prove by your *unwritten Word*. He denies, or at leaſt queſtions, Whether there be *any*, and particularly inſtanceth in *Scripture*; you think to end the Queſtion, by telling him, *He muſt believe it to be ſo, becauſe there is another Word of God which atteſts it*, which, inſtead of *ending* the *firſt Queſtion*, begets a great many more. For, 2. He will be more to ſeek, concerning this *unwritten Word* than before; becauſe he might uſe his *Reaſon* in judging concerning the *written Word*, but cannot as to this *unwritten*; it being only told him, There is ſuch a *thing*, but he knows not *what it is*, *how far it extends*, *who muſt deliver it*, *what evidence this hath beyond the other*, *that it comes from God*, that it muſt be uſed as an *argument* to prove it with. If you ſend him to the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, you muſt either preſume him of a very weak *Underſtanding*, or elſe he would eaſily diſcern your perfect *juggling* in this; the *veins* of which I have diſcovered throughout this diſcourſe. There remains nothing then but

P. 118, &c. n. 8, 9, 10.

but *Reaſon*, a Principle common to us both, by which I muſt prove, that the *Scriptures* are from *God*, which *Reaſon* partly makes uſe of the *Churches Tradition*, not in any notion of *Infallibility*, but meerly as built on *Principles common to humane nature*, and partly uſes thoſe other *arguments* which prove by the greateſt *rational evidence*, that the *Doctrine* contained in *Scripture*, was from *God*; and if this were all the meaning of ſaying, *The Scriptures are a Principle ſuppoſed*, becauſe of a different way of *proving* them, from particular objects of *Faith*, you can have no reaſon to deny it.

The next thing his Lordſhip inſiſts on, is, *That the Jews never had, nor can have any other proof, that the Old Teſtament is the Word of God, than we have of the New.* In your Anſwer to which, I grant that which you contend for, *That the Tradition of Scriptures among them, was by their immediate Anceſtors as well as others*; I grant, *That their Faith was not a Scientifical Knowledge, but a firm and perfect aſſurance only* (but underſtand not what you mean, by ſaying, *That otherwiſe it would not be meritorious*) but am as far to ſeek as ever for any *Infallibility* in the *Jewiſh Church*, which ſhould in every age be the ground of *believing* the *Books* of the *Old Teſtament* to be divinely inſpired. And if you will prove a conſtant *ſucceſſion* of *Prophets* from *Moſes* till our *Saviour*'s appearing (which you ſeem willing to believe) you would do *ſomething* towards it; but for your *permanent Infallible Authority in the High Prieſt and his Clergy*, I have already ſhewed it to be a groundleſs, if not a wilful miſtake. §. 15. P. 123. ſect. 18. n. 5. P. 122. n. 18.

What remains concerning the *nature of Infallibility* (which at laſt his Lordſhip makes to be no more than *that which excludes all poſſibility of doubting*; and therefore grants, *that an Infallible Aſſurance may be had by Eccleſiaſtical and Humane proof*) and how far that is requiſite to *Faith*; *concerning moral Certainty*, and what *Aſſurance may be had by it*; concerning *the Canon of Scripture*, *Apoſtolical Tradition*, *the unwritten Word*, S. Auſtin's *Teſtimony about the Church*, they are all points ſo fully diſcuſſed before, that out of pity to the Reader, I muſt refer him to their ſeveral places, which when he hath throughly conſidered, I will give him leave to *ſum up* the ſeveral *victories* you have obtained in the management of it, which will be much more *honourable* for you, than for your ſelf to do it, as you do moſt *triumphantly* in the *end of this Controverſie concerning the Reſolution of Faith*. And although I have not been much ſurprized with your attempts, yet I ſhall heartily conclude this great Debate with your laſt words in it. *The Conſequence I leave to the ſerious conſideration of the Judicious Reader. I beſeech God he may make benefit of it to his eternal felicity.* P. 124. ſect. 19. P. 123, &c. n. 12. ad fin. cap. 9.

PART II.

PART II.

Of Schiſm.

CHAP. I.

Of the Univerſal Church.

The Queſtion of Schiſm explained. The nature of it enquired into. Several general Principles laid down for clearing the preſent Controverſie. Three grounds of the charge of Schiſm on Proteſtant Churches by our Author. The firſt, of the Roman Churches being the Catholick Church, entred upon. How far the Roman Church may be ſaid to be a true Church. The diſtinction of a Church morally and metaphyſically true juſtified. The grounds of the Unity of the Catholick Church, as to Doctrine and Government. Cardinal Perron's *diſtinction of the formal, cauſal, and participative Catholick Church examined. The true ſenſe of the Catholick Church in Antiquity manifeſted from St.* Cyprian, *and ſeveral caſes happening in his time: as, the Schiſm of* Novatianus *at* Rome; *the caſe of* Feliciſſimus *and* Fortunatus. *Several other Inſtances out of Antiquity to the ſame purpoſe, by all which it is manifeſt that the unity of the Catholick Church had no dependance on the Church of* Rome. *The ſeveral teſtimonies to the contrary of St.* Ambroſe, *St.* Hierom, John *Patriarch of* Conſtantinople, *St.* Auguſtine, Optatus, *&c. particularly examined; and all found ſhort of proving that the Roman Church is the Catholick Church. The ſeveral Anſwers of his Lordſhip to the teſtimonoies of St.* Cyprian, *St.* Hierome, *St.* Greg. Nazianzene, *St.* Cyril, *and* Ruffinus, *about the infallibility of the Church of* Rome, *juſtified. From all which it appears that the making the Roman-Church to be the Catholick, is a great Novelty and perfect Jeſuitiſm.*

§. 1. SInce ſo great and conſiderable parts of the *Chriſtian Church*, have in theſe laſt ages been divided in communion from each other, the great conteſt and enquiry hath been, which party ſtands guilty of the cauſe of the preſent diſtance and ſeparation. For, both ſides retain ſtill ſo much of the common *Chriſtianity*, as to acknowledge that no Religion doth ſo ſtrictly oblige the owners of it to peace and unity as the *Chriſtian Religion* doth; and yet notwithſtanding this, we find theſe breaches ſo far from cloſing, that, ſuppoſing the ſame grounds to continue, a reconciliation ſeems to humane reaſon

reason impossible. An evidence of which, is, that those persons who either out of a generous desire of seeing the wounds of the *Christian* world healed, or out of some private interest or design, have made it their business to propound terms of reconciliation between the divided parties, have been equally rejected by those parties they have professed themselves the members of. For whether any of the *Roman Communion* have ingenuously confessed the greet corruptions crept into that *Church*, and desired a reformation of them, or any of the *Protestant Communion* have endeavoured to excuse, palliate, or plead for the *corruptions* of the *Roman Church*: we find how little encouragement they have had for such undertakings from that *Church* whose Communion they have professed to retain. The distance then being so great as it is, it is a very necessary enquiry what the *cause* of it is, and where the main fault lies; and it being acknowledged that there is a possibility that *corruptions* may get into a *Christian Church*, and it being impossible to prove that *Christianity* obligeth Men to communicate with a *Church* in all those *corruptions* its Communion may be tainted with, it seems evident to reason that the cause of the breach must lye there, where the corruptions are owned and imposed as conditions of Communion. For, can any one imagine it should be a fault in any to keep off from Communion, where they are so far from being obliged to it, that they have an obligation to the contrary, from the principles of their common Christianity? and where Men are bound not to communicate, it is impossible to prove their not communicating to be *Schism*. For there can be no *Schism*, but where there is an obligation to communion; *Schism* being nothing else but a wilful violation of the bonds of *Christian Communion*; and therefore when ever you would prove the *Protestants* guilty of *Schism*, you must do it by proving they were bound to communicate with your *Church* in those things, which they are *Protestants* for disowning of. Or that there is so absolute and unlimited an obligation to continue in the *Society* of your *Church*, that no *conditions* can be so hard, but we are bound rather to submit to them, than not joyn in *Communion* with you. But we who look on the nature of a *Christian Society* in general, the *Foundations* of its *constitution*, the *ends* and *designs* of it, cannot think our selves obliged to Communion in those things which *undermine* those *Foundations*, and *contradict* those *ends*.

This being a matter of so vast consequence, in order to the settling Mens minds in the present disputes of the *Christian* world, before I come to particulars, I shall lay down those general principles which may manifest how free *Protestants* are, from all imputation of *Schism*. *Schism* then importing a *violation* of that *Communion* which we are *obliged* to, the most natural way for understanding what *Schism* is, is to enquire what the *Foundations* are of *Christian Communion*, and how far the *bonds* of it do extend. Now the *Foundations* of *Christian Communion* in general depend upon the acknowledgement of the *truth* of *Christian Religion*. For that *Religion* which *Christ* came to deliver to the world being supposed *true*, is the reason why any look on themselves as obliged to profess it; which *obligation* extending to all persons who have the same grounds to believe the *truth* of it, thence ariseth the ground of *Society* in this profession, which is a common *obligation* on several persons joyning together in some *acts* of common concernment to them. The truth then of *Christian Religion* being acknowledged by several persons, they find in this *Religion* some *actions* which are to be performed by several persons in Society with each other. From whence ariseth that more immediate obligation to *Christian Society*, in all those who profess §. 2

ſelves *Chriſtians*; and the whole number of *theſe* who own the truth of Chriſtian Religion and are thereby obliged to joyn in Society with each other, is that which we call the *Catholick Church*. But although there be ſuch a relation to each other in all *Chriſtians* as to make them one common Society; yet for the performance of particular *acts* of communion, there muſt be leſſer *Societies* wherein perſons may joyn together in the actions belonging to them. But ſtill the *obligation* to communion in theſe *leſſer*, is the ſame with that which conſtitutes the great body of *Chriſtians*, which is the owning *Chriſtianity* as the only true Religion and way to eternal Happineſs. And therefore thoſe leſſer *Societies* cannot in juſtice make the neceſſary conditions of communion narrower, than thoſe which belong to the *Catholick Church*, i. e. thoſe things which declare Men *Chriſtians*, ought to capacitate them for communion with *Chriſtians*. But here we are to conſider that as to be a *Chriſtian* ſuppoſeth Mens owning the *Chriſtian Religion* to be *true*, ſo the conveyance of that *Religion* being to us now in thoſe *Books* we call the *Scriptures*, there muſt be an acknowledgement of them as the indiſpenſable rule of *Faith* and *Manners*, which is, That theſe *Books* are the *great Charter* of the *Chriſtian Society*, according to which it muſt be governed.

§. 3. Theſe things being premiſed as the foundation in general of *Chriſtian Society*, we ſhall the better underſtand how far the *obligation* to *communion* in it doth extend. For which it muſt be conſidered, that the grounds of *continuance* in *Communion*, muſt be ſuitable and proportionable to the firſt *reaſon* of entring into it. No Man being obliged by vertue of his being in a Society, to agree in any thing which tends to the apparent ruine of that Society; but he is obliged to the contrary, from the general grounds of his firſt admiſſion into it. His primary *obligation* being to preſerve the *honour* and *intereſt* of it, and to joyn in *acts* of it ſo far as they tend to it. Now the main end of the *Chriſtian Society* being the promotion of *God's honour* and the *ſalvation* of *Men's ſouls*, the primary *obligation* of Men entring into it, is the advancement of theſe *ends*, to joyn in all *acts* of it ſo far as they tend to theſe *ends*; but if any thing come to be required directly repugnant to theſe *ends*, thoſe Men of whom ſuch things are required, are bound not to *communicate* in thoſe leſſer *Societies* where ſuch *things* are impoſed, but to preſerve their communion with the *Catholick Society* of *Chriſtians*. But theſe general diſcourſes ſeeming more obſcure, it will be neceſſary for the better ſubſerviency of them to our deſign, to deduce them into particulars. Setting then aſide the *Catholick Society* of *Chriſtians*, we come to enquire how far Men are bound to communicate with any leſſer *Society*, how extenſive ſoever it may pretend its communion to be.

1. *There is no Society of Chriſtians of any one Communion, but may impoſe ſome things to be believed or practiſed which may be repugnant to the general Foundations of Chriſtian Society.* But if any *Society* ſhall pretend a neceſſity of communion with her, becauſe it is impoſſible this ſhould be done by her: this priviledge muſt in reaſon be as evident as the common grounds of *Chriſtianity* are; nay much more evident, becauſe the belief of *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, doth (upon this pretence) depend on the knowledge of ſuch *Infallibility*, and the indiſpenſable obligation to communion depends upon it.

2. *There being a poſſibility acknowledged, that particular Churches may require unreaſonable conditions of communion; the obligation to communion cannot*

cannot be abſolute and indiſpenſable; but only ſo far as nothing is required deſtructive to the ends of Chriſtian Society. Otherwiſe Men would be bound to deſtroy that which they believe, and to do the moſt unjuſt and unreaſonable things. But the great difficulty lies in knowing when ſuch things are required, and who muſt be the judge in that caſe: to which I anſwer,

3. *Nothing can be more unreaſonable, than that the Society impoſing ſuch conditions of communion ſhould be judge, whether thoſe conditions be juſt and equitable or no.* If the queſtion only were in matters of peace, and conveniency, and order, the judgement of the *Society* ought to over-rule the judgements of particular perſons, but in ſuch caſes where great Bodies of *Chriſtians*, judge ſuch things required, to be unlawful conditions of communion, what juſtice or reaſon is there, that the party accuſed ſhould ſit Judge in her own cauſe?

4. *Where there is ſufficient evidence from Scripture, reaſon, and tradition, that ſuch things which are impoſed are unreaſonable conditions of Chriſtian communion, the not communicating with that Society which requires theſe things cannot incur the guilt of Schiſm.* Which neceſſarily follows from the precedent grounds, becauſe none can be obliged to communion in ſuch caſes, and therefore the not communicating is no culpable *ſeparation.*

5. *By how much the Societies are greater which are agreed in not communicating with a Church impoſing ſuch conditions, by how much the power of thoſe who rule thoſe Societies ſo agreeing is larger, by ſo much the more juſtifiable is the Reformation of any Church from theſe abuſes, and the ſettling the bonds of Chriſtian communion without them.* And on thoſe grounds, *viz.* the *Church of* Romes *impoſing unlawful conditions of communion*, it was neceſſary *not to communicate* with her; and on the *Church of* Englands *power to reform it ſelf* by the aſſiſtance of the *Supreme power*, it was lawful and juſtifiable not only to redreſs thoſe *abuſes*, but to ſettle the *Church* upon its proper and true foundations. So that the *Church* of *Romes* impoſing unlawful conditions of communion, is the reaſon why we do *not communicate* with her, and the *Church of Englands* power to govern and take care of *her* ſelf, is the reaſon of our joyning together in the *ſervice* of *God* upon the principles of our *Reformation.* On theſe grounds I doubt not but to make it appear, how free the *Church* of *England* is from all imputation of *Schiſm.*

§. 4. Theſe things being thus in general premiſed, we come to conſider what thoſe principles are on which you can found ſo high a charge as that of *Schiſm* on the *Proteſtant Churches.* And having throughly conſidered your way of management of it, I find all that you have to ſay may be reſolved into one of theſe three grounds. 1. *That the Roman Church is the true and only Catholick Church.* 2. *That our Churches could have no power or cauſe to divide in their Communion from her.* 3. *That the authority of the Roman Church is ſo great, that upon no pretence ſoever could it be lawful to withdraw from Communion with her.* I confeſs, if you can make good any one of theſe *three*, you do ſomething to the purpoſe; but how little ground you have to charge us with *Schiſm* from any of theſe Principles, will be the deſign of this *Part* at large to manifeſt. I begin then with the *firſt*, which is the pretence of your *Churches being the Catholick Church:* and here we again enter the *liſts* to ſee how fairly you deal with your *Adverſary.* Mr. *Fiſher* ſaith, *That from the Controverſie of the reſolution of Faith the Lady called*

them; and desiring to hear, whether the Bishop would grant the Roman Church
P. 127. sect. 20. n. 1. *to be the right Church? the Bishop* (saith he) *granted that it was.* To which his Lordship answers (after a just complaint *of the abuse of disputations, by Mens resolution to hold their own, though it be by unworthy means and disparagement of truth*) *that the question was neither asked in that form, nor so answered. And that there is a great deal of difference (especially as Romanists handle the question of the Church) between The Church and A Church, and there is some between a True Church and a Right Church. For the Church may import the only true Church, and perhaps the root and ground of the Catholick. And this*
N. 2. (saith he) *I never did grant of the Roman Church, nor ever mean to do. But A Church, can imply no more, than that it is a member of the whole. And this I never did* (saith he) *nor ever will deny, if it fall not absolutely away from Christ. That it is a True Church I granted also; but not a Right. For Truth only imports the being; right, perfection in conditions; thus a Thief is a true Man, tho' not an upright Man. So a corrupt Church may be true, as a Church is a company of Men which profess the Faith of Christ and are baptized into his Name; but it is not therefore a right Church, either in doctrine or manners. And this* (he saith) *is acknowledged by very learned Protestants before him.* This is the substance of his Lordships answer, to which we must consider
P. 127. c. 2. n. 1. what you reply, *That about the terms of the Lady's question* you grant *to be a verbal Controversie; and that whatever her words were, she was to be understood to demand this alone,* viz. *Whether the Roman were not the True, Visible, Infallible Church out of which none can be saved; for herein* (you say) *she had from the beginning of the Controversie desired satisfaction: And in this subject the Roman Church could not be any Church at all, unless it were the Church and a Right*
P. 128. n. 2. *Church. The reason is because S.* Peter's *successor, being the Bishop of* Rome, *and Head of the whole Church* (as you tell us *you will prove anon*) *that must needs be the Church* καθ' ἐξοχὴν *if it be any Church at all. And because the Church can be but one, if it be a true Church it must be the right Church.* But all this amounts only to a confident assertion of that which wants evident proof, which is, that the notion of a *Church* relates to *one as appointed the Head of the whole Church, without which it would be no Church at all.* Which being a thing so hard to be understood, and therefore much harder to be proved, we must be content to wait your leasure till you shall think fit to prove it. When you therefore tell us afterwards, *That the Universal Church supposes the acknowledgement of the same Vicar of Christ, and that those Dioceses which agree in this acknowledgement as well as in the same Faith, and communion of the same Sacraments make up one and the same Universal Church*; When you further add, *That the Roman Church is therefore stiled the Church, because it is the seat of the Vicar of Christ, and chief Pastor of the Church Universal:* I can only say to all these confident affirmations, that if you had sate in the *chair* your self, you could not have *said* more or *proved* less. It is not therefore in what sense words *may be* taken by you (for who questions but you may abuse words?) but in what *sense* they *ought* to be taken. You may call *the Bishop of Rome the Vicar of Christ*, but before you can expect our submission to him, you must prove *that he is so.* You may call the *Roman Church*, *The Church*, if you please, among your selves: but if by that you would perswade us there can be no *Church* but that, you would do an office of kindness to offer a little at some small proof of it, *i.e.* as much as the cause, and your ablilities will afford. And what if *the Antients by a true Church did mean an Orthodox Church?* I know but one of these things will follow from it, either that they took a *true Church* for one *morally* and not *metaphysically true*; or that if your *Church* be not an *Orthodox Church*, it can be none at all. From hence you proceed

to

to quarrel with his *Lordſhip* for ſaying, *That may be a true Church which is not a right Church* (which is all the thanks he hath for his kindneſs to you) *for* (ſay you) *How can you call that a true Church in which Men are not taught the way to Heaven, but to eternal Perdition?* Which is as much as to ask, How you can call that Man a *true Man* that hath a *Leproſie* upon him? But if you had conſidered, what his *Lordſhip* had ſaid, you would never have made ſuch an objection. For his *Lordſhip* doth not ſpeak of the *ſoundneſs* of a *Church*, but of the *metaphyſical entity* of it. For he ſaith, *It is true in that ſenſe as* ens *and* verum, *Being and True, are convertible one with another; and every thing that hath a Being is truly that Being which it is in truth of ſubſtance. But* (ſay you) *How can that be a true Church which teacheth the way to eternal Perdition by ſome falſe Doctrine in matter of Faith? Becauſe it either teacheth ſomething to be the Word of God which is not; or denies that to be his Word which is: to err in this ſort is certainly to commit an high and mortal offence againſt the honour and veracity of God, and conſequently the direct way to eternal Perdition.* An excellent diſcourſe to prove that no Man can be ſaved that is not Infallible! For if he be not infallible he may either *teach ſomething to be God's which is not, or deny that to be his Word that is; either of which being a mortal offence againſt the honour and veracity of God*, it is impoſſible any Man that is not Infallible ſhould be ſaved: either then we muſt put off that humanity which expoſes us to error, or pronounce it impoſſible for any Men to be ſaved, or elſe aſſert that there may be *error* where *God's* veracity is not denied. And if ſo, then not only Men ſeverally but a *Society* of *Men* may propound that for *truth* which is not, and yet not mortally offend againſt *God's veracity*; ſuppoſing that *Society* of Men doth believe (though falſly) that this is therefore *true* becauſe revealed by *God*. In which caſe that *Church* may be a *true Church* in one ſenſe, though an *erroneous Church* in another: *true*, as there is a poſſibility of ſalvation in it; *erroneous*, as delivering that for truth which is not ſo. But here is a great deal of difference between a *Church* acknowledging her ſelf fallible, and that which doth not. For ſuppoſe a *Church* propoſe ſomething *erroneous* to be believed, if ſhe doth not arrogate *Infallibility* to her ſelf in that *propoſal*, but requires Men to ſearch and examine her Doctrine by the *Word of God*, the danger is nothing ſo great to the Perſons in her Communion; but when a *Church* pretends to be *Infallible* and *teacheth errors*, that Church requiring thoſe *errors* to be believed upon her Authority, without particular examination of the *Doctrines* propoſed, is chargeable with a higher offence againſt the *honour* and *veracity* of *God*, and doth as much as in her lies (in your expreſſion) *teach Men the way to eternal Perdition*. And of all ſorts of *blind guides* it is moſt dangerous following ſuch who pretend to be *Infallible* in their *blindneſs*; and it is a great miracle if ſuch do not fall paſt recovery. The more therefore you aggravate the danger of *error*, the worſe ſtill you make the condition of your *Church*, where Men are bound to believe the *Church Infallible*, when ſhe propoſeth the moſt *dangerous errors*. When you ſay, *The whole Church is not liable to theſe inconveniencies of ſeducing or being ſeduced*, if you mean (as you ſpeak) of that which is *truly the whole Church of Chriſt*, you are to ſeek for an *Adverſary* in it; if you mean the *Roman Church*, you are either *ſeduced* or endeavour to *ſeduce* in ſaying ſo, when neither that is or can be *the whole Church*, neither is it free from believing or propoſing errors, as will appear afterwards. You quarrel with his Lordſhip again, *for his Similitude of a Man that may be termed a Man and not be honeſt, and ſay it comes not home to the caſe.*

N. 3.

Sect. 20. n. 2

P. 129.

But we muſt ſee, how well you have fitted it. *Inſtead of a Man*, you would have *a Saintput*, *and then*, (you ſay) *the Parallel would have held much*

much better. But certainly then you mean only such *Saints* as *Rome* takes upon her to *Canonize*; for the Question was of *one* that might be a *Man*, and *not be honest*, Will you say the same of your *Saint* too? If instead of *Saint*, you had put his *Holiness* in, there are some in the World would not have quarrelled with you for it. But you are an excellent Man at parallelling Cases: His *Lordship* was speaking of the *Metaphysical Truth of a Church being consistent with moral Corruptions*, for which he instanced in *a Thiefs being truly a Man, though not an honest Man*; now you, to mend the matter, make choice of *moral Integrity, being consistent with Metaphysical Truth, which is of a Saint, and a Man.* And, Doth not this now come home to our case? That which follows, to shew the Incongruity of his *Lordship's* Similitude, would much more shew your wit, if it were capable of to-
P.129.n.3. lerable sense: *For*, you say, *the word Church in our present debate, implies not a simple or uncompounded Term, as that of Man, but is a Compound of Substance and Accidents together.* We had thought Man had been a *compound* of *substance* and *accidents*, as well as a *Church*: Or, Did you mean some *transubstantiated Man*, that had *accidents without substance*? But as his *Lordship* spake of a *true real Man*, who yet might want *moral Integrity*; so he supposed there might be a *true real Church*, as to the *essential parts* of it, which yet might be in other respects a *corrupted* and *defiled Church.* But when you add, *That the notion of a Church implies Integrity and Perfection of Conditions*, still you betray your weak or wilful mistakes of a *Church Morally* for *Metaphysically true.* If you will prove it impossible for a *Church* to retain its *Being*, that hath any *errors* in *Doctrine*, or *corruptions* in *Practice*, you will do something to the purpose: But when you have done it, see what you get by it; for then we shall not so much as acknowledge your *Church* to be *Metaphysically* a *true Church.* If his *Lordship* therefore be so charitable, as to say, *That because your Church receives the Scripture as a Rule of Faith: (though but as a partial and imperfect Rule) and both the Sacraments as Instrumental causes and seals of Grace (though they add more, and misuse these) it cannot but be a true Church in essence:* And you, on the other side, say, *If it doth misuse the Sacraments, and make the Scripture an imperfect Rule of Faith, it would be Unchurched*; Let the Reader judge, whether his *Lordship's* Charity for, or your own Testimony against your *Church*, be built on better grounds. What follows concerning the *Holy Catholick Church in the Apostles Creed, the intire Catholick Faith in the Athanasian Creed, the Churches being the Spouse of Christ, and a pure Virgin*, are all things as *true* in themselves, as your *Church* is little concerned in them. The *truly Catholick Church* being quite another thing from that which goes under the name of the *Roman Catholick Church*; and this *latter* may *prostitute* her self to *error*, while the *other* remains a *pure Virgin*; and it is only your saying, That *yours only is the Catholick Church*, which is in effect to say, *That Christ hath a Harlot to his Spouse*, as you speak.

§. 6. To omit that which you call, *A further skirmishing about the form of words,*
P.129.n.4. *and whether it savoured more of prudence, and charity, or cunning in the Jesuite, to instruct the Lady what Questions she should ask*; we come to that which is the main subject of this Chapter, *viz. Whether the Church be stiled Catholick by its agreeing with* Rome, *which* (you say) *was a received and known Truth in the*
P.130.n.4. *Ancient Church*, but is so far from being in the least true, that his *Lordship* deservedly calls it, *A perfect Jesuitism. For* (saith he) *in all the Primitive Times of the Church, a Man, or a Family, or a National Church were accounted right and orthodox, as they agreed with the Catholick Church, but the Catholick was never then measured or judged by Man, Family, or Nation. But now in the*

Jesuits

Jesuits new School, the One, Holy, Catholick Church, must be measured by that which is in the Diocese or City of Rome, *or of them which agreed with it; and not* Rome *by the Catholick. So upon the matter, belike the Christian Faith was committed to the custody of the* Roman, *not of the Catholick Church; and a Man cannot agree with the Catholick Church of Christ (in this new Doctrine of* A. C.) *unless he agree with the Church of* Rome; *but if he agree with that, all is safe, and he is as orthodox, as he need be.* To which you seem to answer at first by some slight tergiversations, *as though this did not follow from* A. C.*'s words, and that the Lady did not trouble her self with such Punctilio's as those of the agreement of the Catholick Church with* Rome, *or* Rome's *agreeing with the Catholick Church,* but at last you take heart, and affirm stoutly, *That the Church is stiled Catholick from its agreement with* Rome, *and that this is no Jesuitism, but a received and known Truth in the Ancient Church.* In these terms then I fix my self, and this present dispute; as containing the proper state of the *Controversie* concerning the *Catholick Church.* And if you can make it appear that the *Church is stiled Catholick by agreeing with* Rome, *and that this was a received Truth in the Ancient Church,* then you may very plausibly charge us with *Schism* in our separation from *Rome*; but if the contrary be made evident, by your own pretence we are freed from that charge. P. 131.

Now in the handling this Controversie, you first explain your terms, and then produce your Testimonies. In the explication of your terms, you tell us, *The word Catholick may be used in three different Acceptions,* viz, *either formally, causally, or by way of participation. Formally, the Universal Church,* i. e. *the society of all true particular Churches, united together in one Body, in one Communion under one Head, is called Catholick. Causally the Church of* Rome *is stiled Catholick, because it hath an influence and force to cause Universality in the whole body of the Church Catholick; to which two things are necessary, Multitude and Unity. The* Roman *Church therefore, which as a Center of Ecclesiastical Communion, infuses this Unity which is the form of Universality, into the Catholick Church, and thereby causes in her Universality, may be called Catholick causally, though she be but a particular Church. As he that commands a whole Army is stiled General, though he be but a particular Person. Thirdly, every particular Orthodox Church is termed Catholick* participativè, *by way of participation, because they agree in, and participate of the Doctrine and Communion of the Catholick Church. For which* (you bring) *the instance of the Church of* Smyrna *writing to the Catholick Church of* Philomilion, &c. *Thus we see* (say you) *both how properly the* Roman *Church is called Catholick, and how the Catholick Church it self takes causally the denomination of Universal or Catholick from the* Roman, *considered as the chief particular Church, infusing Unity into all the rest, as having dependence of her, and relation to her.* Thus I have recited your words, that we may fully understand your meaning, the substance of which is couched in your last words, *That the reason why any Church was accounted Catholick, was from its Union with the Church of* Rome. But if it appear that this sense of the *Catholick Church* is wholly a stranger to Antiquity, That the *Catholick Church* was so call'd upon far different accounts than those mentioned by you; if the *Church* of *Rome* had no other relation to the *Catholick Church* but as a *Member* of it as other *Churches* were, then all this discourse of yours comes to nothing, and that is it which I now undertake to prove. Now the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* lying in two things, the *Doctrine* and the *Government* of it, if in neither of these it had any *dependence of the Church of Rome,* then certainly it could not be called *Catholick, causally* from the *Church of Rome.* P. 130. n. 5.

First,

First, the *Church* was call'd *Catholick* from the *universal spread* of its *Doctrine*, and the *agreement of all particular Churches* in it. So *Irenæus* derives the *Unity* of the *Church* spread abroad over the World from the *Unity* of that *Faith* which was Universally received, and from thence saith, *That the Church is but as one House, and having one Soul and Heart, and speaks as with one mouth.* Nothing can be more plain than that *Irenæus* makes the *consent in Doctrine* to be the *ground of Unity* in the *Catholick Church.* And that he did not suppose this consent to arise from the *Church of Rome*, appears from what he saith before, *That this Faith was received in the Church so universally spread from the Apostles and their Disciples.* Which must be understood of that universal diffusion of it by the *first Preachers* of it in the World, the continuance of which *Doctrine* was the ground of the *Unity* in the *Catholick Church.* To the same purpose *Tertullian* gives an account of the *Churches Unity, by the adhering to that Doctrine which was first Preached by the Apostles, who having first delivered it in* Judea *and planted Churches there, went abroad and declared the same to other Nations and settled Churches in Cities, from whence other Churches have the same Doctrine propagated to them, which are therefore call'd Apostolical Churches, as the off-spring of those which were founded by them. Therefore so many and so great Churches, are all that one prime Apostolical Church from whence all others come. And thus they are all prime and Apostolical in regard of their Unity, as long as there is that communication of Peace, title of Brotherhood, and common mark of Hospitality.* Wherein we see, that which made *Churches* in *Tertullian's* sense *Apostolical*, is the *embracing and continuing in that Doctrine which was first delivered by the Apostles*; and thus *Churches* though remote from the *Apostolical* times may have the denomination of *Apostolical* from their consent in *Doctrine* with those which were founded by them. But here is not the least intimation of *any Centre of Ecclesiastical Communion* infusing *Unity* into the *Catholick Church*, for this *Unity* ariseth from that *Doctrine* which was declared in and propagated by all the *Apostolical Churches.* So likewise *Theodoret* speaks, *That there is one Church throughout the World, and therefore we pray, for the Holy, One, Catholick, and Apostolick Church, extended from one end of the Earth to the other. Which* (saith he) *is divided by Cities, and Towns, and Villages, so that there are infinite and innumerable Churches in the Islands and Continent, but all these are reduced to one, being united in the agreement of the same true Doctrine.* So *Constantine* in his *Epistle* to the *Bishops* who were absent from the *Council* of *Nice*, saith, *That our Saviour would have one Catholick Church, whose members though dispersed in many several places, yet are nourished by the same Spirit which is the Will of God.* In all which

Hanc prædicationem cum acceperit, & hanc fidem quemadmodum prædiximus, Ecclesia, & quidem in universum mundum dissemināta, diligentèr custodit, quasi unam domum inhabitans, & similitèr credit iis, videlicet quasi unam animam habens, & unum cor & consonantèr hæc prædicat & docet & tradit quasi unum possidens os. Irenæus adverſ. hæreſ. l. 1. c. 3.

Ecclesia enim per universum orbem usq; ad fines terræ dissēminata, & ab Apostolis & à discipulis eorum accepit eam fidem, &c. l. 1. c. 2.

Statim igitur Apostoli——1. *per Judæam contestatâ fide in Jesum Christum & Ecclesiis institutis; dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei Nationibus promulgavêrunt, & proinde Ecclesias apud unamquamq; civitatem condidêrunt, à quibus traducem fidei & semina doctrinæ, cæteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt, & quotidie mutuantur ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc & ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam recensēatur, necesse est. Itaq; tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ & Apostolicæ, dum unâ omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & contesseratio hospitalitatis.* Tertul. de præscript. hæretic. cap. 20.

Μία μὲν ὅτι κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ἐκκλησία· διὸ προσδέχόμεθα λέγομεν, ὑπὲρ ἁγίας καὶ μόνης καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, τῆς ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης· ἔπειτα μυρίαι καὶ ἀριθμῷ κρείττους εἰσὶν ἐκκλησίαι, καὶ ἐν νήσοις καὶ ἐν ἠπείροις, εἰς μίαν δὲ κοινῇ πᾶσαι τελοῦσι τῇ συμφωνίᾳ τῶν ἀληθῶν νενομίσαι δογμάτων. Theodoret. in Pſal. 47. 4. Tom. 1. p. 580.

Μίαν δὲ καὶ καθολικὴν αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν βεβλήκασι, ἧς εἰ καὶ τὰ μέρισα εἰς πολλούς τε καὶ διαφόρους τόπους τὰ μέρη διήρηται, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἑνὶ πνεύματι, τοῦτέστι τῷ θείῳ βουλήματι θάλπεται. Theod. Eccleſi. hiſt. l. 1. c. 9.

which and many other places which might be produced to the same purpose, we see a quite different account given of the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*, from that which you mention as the cause of it; we find the *Church* call'd *Catholick* in regard of its *large extent* in the world (as is apparent besides these testimonies, from the Controversies between S. *Austin* and the *Donatists*) and the *unity* of that *Catholick Church* not placed in the least respect to the *Church of Rome*, but in the *consent* in the *Apostolical Doctrine* in all those *Churches* which concurred as members to make up this *Catholick Church*. So that the *formal reason* of any particular *Churches* having the denomination of *Catholick*, must come not from any *communion* with the *Church of Rome*; but from the *owning* the *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*, and joyning in *communion* with those *Churches* which did own and acknowledge it. And therefore we find that the *symbol* of *communion* in the ancient *communicatory letters* never lay in the acknowledgment of *Christ's Vicar on earth*, or communion with the *Church of Rome*, but in such things which were common to all *Apostolical Churches*. And therefore the *Church of Rome* could not be then accounted *the center of Ecclesiastical communion* as you speak, after *Cardinal Perron*, from whom you have *Verbatim* transcribed all your former discourse. This being therefore the utmost which that great wit of your *Church* was able to plead in behalf of its being the *Catholick Church*, it deserves to be further considered. *Perrons* Reply to King *James*, l. 4. c. 9.

We come therefore to that kind of *unity* in the *Catholick Church* which depends on the *Government* of it; and this is that, which is pretended as the ground of the *Roman Churches* being the *Catholick Church*; because *though* (as *Cardinal Perron* says) *she be in her own Being particular, yet she may be call'd Catholick causally, as the center and beginning of Ecclesiastical Communion infusing unity, which is the form of universality, into the Catholick Church.* This therefore must be more narrowly searched into, to see if this were *a known and received truth in the ancient Church.* Which is so far from it, that we find no such *causal influence* from the *Church of Rome* then owned or asserted, but that the *Catholick Church* was a *whole* consisting of *homogeneal parts*, without any such *subordination* or *dependence*, as the contrary supposition implies. This is, by none more fully asserted, than by such who have with the greatest zeal and industry stood up for the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*. The first of whom is St. *Cyprian*; in whose time and writings there are very remarkable cases occurring to clear, upon what terms the *unity* of the *Catholick Church* did then stand. The first I begin with, is the case which arose in the *Church* about the *Schism* of *Novatianus*, which will give us the fuller discovery of the grounds of *unity* in the *Catholick Church*, because the first rise of this *Schism* was in *Rome* it self. For *Novatus* coming to *Rome* in a discontent from *Africa*, falls in with *Novatianus* (which two names the *Greek writers* of the Church commonly confound) who being likewise under discontent at the election of *Cornelius* to be *Bishop* of *Rome*, was ready to joyn with the other in fomenting a *Schism*. For which they made this their pretext, That *Cornelius* had admitted such to communion who had lapsed in the persecution of *Decius*, which tended to the overthrow of the *Churches* purity. Upon this *Novatianus* gets himself ordained, by three *Bishops*, *Bishop* of *Rome* in opposition to *Cornelius*: the fame of which *Schism* being spread abroad, there was great making of parties on both sides. *Cyprian* and the *Churches* of *Africa* after full inquiry into it declare for *Cornelius*, so

§. 8.

v. Rigalt. ad Cypr. ep. 49. Petav. ad Epiphan. hæres. 59. p. 226. Vales. ad Euseb. l. 6. c. 43, 44. Albaspin. & Balduin. in Optat.

did *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* and the *Churches* there; but *Fabius* of *Antioch* with the *Churches* of *Pontus* and *Cilicia* ſuſpend, and rather encline to *Novatianus*, for ſome time; till they were after, more fully ſatisfied by *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*. Now here is a caſe wherein the grounds of *unity* in the *Catholick Church* may be eaſily diſcerned, which it is plain from the proceedings in it, where (as in all ſuch emergent caſes) what ſhould be *determined* and *agreed* on, by the *conſent of the Catholick Church: i. e.* of thoſe *Churches* which all conſented in the ſame *Catholick Faith*, and therefore made up *one Catholick Church*. Now if the *Church* of *Rome* had been *the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion, and had infuſed Catholick unity into the Church at this time*, what way or poſſibility had there been for reſtoring the *Churches* unity? Neither was the appeal made to *forraign Churches* meerly becauſe *Rome* it ſelf was divided, and ſo the Controverſie could not be ended there, but it appears from the whole ſtory of the proceedings, that this was looked on as the proper means for preſerving the *unity* of the *Catholick Church*, at that time; when the Faith and communion of the *Apoſtolical Churches* were ſo fully known and diſtinguiſhed from all others. Theſe things will more fully appear from S. *Cyprians* Epiſtle to *Antonianus* upon the occaſion of this *Schiſm*. Who it ſeems at firſt adhered to *Cornelius* and with him to the *Catholick Church*, (not as tho' his joyning with *Cornelius* was the *cauſe* of his being with the *Catholick Church*, but becauſe in joyning with him he joyn'd with the *Catholick Church*, which declared for him;) but it ſeems afterwards by ſome Letters of *Novatianus* he began to ſtagger, and deſires *Cyprian* to give him an account what Hereſie *Novatianus* broached, and what the reaſon was why *Cornelius* communicated with the lapſed perſons. As to which particulars he endeavours to ſatisfie him, and withal to give an account why they joyned with *Cornelius* in oppoſition to *Novatianus*, and what the practice of the *Church* was, as to lapſed perſons, and on what reaſons it was built: wherein he tells him, That tho' ſome of their own *Biſhops* had formerly denied communion to lapſed perſons, yet they did not recede from the *Unity of the Catholick Church*, or communion of the Fellowſhips, becauſe by them they were admitted. *For*, ſaith he, *the bond of concord remaining, and the communion of the Catholick Church continuing, every Biſhop orders and diſpoſeth his own actions as one that muſt give an account of his deſign to God.* Doth S. *Cyprian* here ſpeak like one that believed *the Church of Rome to be the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion?* or *that the unity of the Church lay in acknowledging the Pope to be Chriſt's Vicar, or in dependence on the Church of Rome?* when every *Biſhop is left to himſelf and God*, in all ſuch things which he may do, and yet hold communion with the *Catholick Church*. And therefore afterwards he tells us, *That there is one Church divided into many members throughout the world, and one epiſcopal office ſpread abroad, by the conſenting multitude of many Biſhops.* If this *Church* be one in this ſenſe, and the whole Government of the Church be but as one *Biſhoprick*, as all the Biſhops unanimouſly conſent in the *management* of it; then here is not the leaſt foundation for the *Catholick Churches taking its denomination cauſally* from the *Roman Church*, and much leſs for the *Biſhops* having dependence on her, or relation to her. Since the care and government of the Church by theſe words of *Cyprian* appears to be equally committed to all the *Biſhops* of the *Catholick Church*. And from thence it was, that in this *Epiſtle* we read that S. *Cyprian* writ to the *Church* of *Rome* after the death of *Fabianus*, to adviſe them what to do in the caſe of

Cyprian. ep. 52. ed. Rigalt.

Manente concordiæ vinculo, & perſeverante Catholicæ Eccleſiæ individuo ſacramento, actum ſuum diſponit ac dirigit unuſquiſq; epiſcopus, rationem propoſiti ſui Domino redditurus. Cyprian. ep. 52.

Cum ſit à Chriſto una Eccleſia per totum mundum in multa membra diviſa: item Epiſcopatus unus, Epiſcoporum multorum concordi numeroſitate diffuſus. Id. ib. p. 81.

lapsed persons, which letters of his were sent through the world; which, *Rigaltius* well observes, did arise from *that unity of Ecclesiastical discipline*, *whereby* Cyprian, *not doubting but the care of all Churches was upon him*, *dispatched these Leters to the Clergy at* Rome; *from whence they were sent through the Catholick Church*, *as an evidence that there was but one Episcopal office in the whole Church*, *part of which was committed in full power to every Bishop.* Thus we see a quite different account given of the *unity* of the *Catholick Church* than what you from *Cardinal Perron* would perswade us of. It being an easie matter for Men of wit and parts (especially such as that great *Cardinal* was master of) to coyn distinctions to make the most *absurd* things seem *plausible*; but yet when they come to be examined, they are found to have no other *bottom* but the invention of that person who coyned them.

Itaq; ex unitatis Ecclesiasticæ disciplinâ, Cyprianus solicitudinem omnium Ecclesiarum ad se pertinere non ambigens, etiam Romam se dedisse literas ait ad clerum. Eas verò literas per totum mundum missas, h. e. per Ecclesiam Catholicam, cujus Ecclesiæ unus est Episcopatus, atq; hujusmodi Episcopatûs à singulis Episcopis in solidum pars tenebatur, Rigalt. observ. ad Cypr. p. 64.

And that it is so as to this distinction of the *formal*, *causal*, and *participative Catholick Church*, will be further evident from another case which happened in S. *Cyprian*'s time, which was this. *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus* being cast out of communion by a *Synod* of *African Bishops*, when they saw they could do little good in *Africa*, run over to *Rome*, and bring letters to *Cornelius* the *Bishop* there, misrepresenting the whole business of their being ejected out of the Church, on purpose to perswade *Cornelius* to admit them into communion. Who at first being unwilling to hearken to them, was at last by their threats and menaces brought to receive their letters. Upon which S. *Cyprian* writes an Epistle to *Cornelius*, wherein he tells him, That if the threats of such profligate persons should relax the *Churches* discipline, all the *power* and *strength* of it would be soon taken away; that the ground of all *Schism* and *Heresie* arises from *Disobedience to the Bishop*. Certainly he doth not mean the *Bishop of Rome*, but every *Bishop* in the *Catholick Church* (for it was not *Cornelius* but *Cyprian* and the *African Bishops* who were disobeyed) upon which he falls upon the matter of their *appeal* to a *forraign Church*, and after some fair commendations of the *Church of Rome* (the meaning of which will be afterwards examined) he very sharply condemns these appeals to forraign *Churches* as *unreasonable*, *unjust*, and *dishonourable* to those *Bishops*, whose sentence they appealed from. *For*, *What cause* (saith he) *could these persons have of coming and declaring against their Bishops? For either they are pleased in what they have done, and continue in their wickedness; or if they are displeased at it and recede from it, they know whither to return. For since it is decreed by us all, and it is a thing just and reasonable in it self, that every ones cause be heard where the fault was committed, and every Pastour hath a part of the flock committed to him, which he is to rule and govern as being to give an account of it to God; it is requisite that those whom we rule over, ought not to run about, and break the concord of Bishops by their headiness and subtilty; but there to defend their cause, where they may have accusers and witnesses of their faults. Unless it be, that to a few desperate and profligate persons the authority of the Bishops of* Africa *seems less to them, who have already sat in judgement upon them, and solemnly condemned them lately for their crimes.*

§. 9.

Quæ autem causâ veniendi & pseudo-episcoporum contra Episcopos factum nunciandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt, & in suo scelere perseverant: Aut, si displicet & recedunt, sciunt quò revertantur. Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusq; causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisq; & gubernet, rationem sui actûs Domino redditurus: oportet utiq; eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare nec Episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sibi subdolâ & fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi & accusatores habere & testes sui criminis possint: nisi si paucis desperatis & perditis minor videtur esse auctoritas Episcoporum in Africâ constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicavêrunt, & eorum conscientiam multis delictorum laqueis vinctam judicii sui nuper gravitate damnârunt. Cyprian. ep. 55. p. 95.

Can any thing be more expreſs and punctual than this teſtimony of *Cyprian* is, to overthrow that ſenſe of the *Catholick Church* which you contend for? How far were *Cyprian* and the *African Biſhops* from making *Rome the center of Eccleſiaſtical communion*, when they looked on *appeals* thither as *very unjuſt and unreaſonable?* What *acknowledgement* and *dependence* was there on the *Church of Rome* in thoſe who looked on themſelves as having *a portion of Chriſts flock committed to them, of which they were to give an account to God alone?* And I pray what excellent perſons were thoſe who undervalued the Authority of the *African Biſhops, and ran to Rome?* S. *Cyprian* tells us, they were *pauci, deſperati, perditi*, and tranſlate theſe with as much advantage to your *cauſe* as you can. So fatal hath it been to *Rome* even from its firſt foundation to be a *receptacle* for ſuch perſons. And is not this a great credit to your cauſe, that ſuch *perſons* who were ejected out of *communion* for their crimes at home, did make their reſort to *Rome?* and the more pious and ſtout any *Biſhops* were, the more they defend their own *privileges* in oppoſition to the *encroachments* of the *Roman See.* Which was apt to take advantage from ſuch *Renegado's* as theſe were, by degrees to get more power into her hands, and lift up her head above her *fellow-Churches.* But leſt you ſhould think that S. *Cyprian* only ſpake theſe things in an heat, out of his oppoſition to theſe *perſons* and his deſire to cruſh them, you ſhall ſee what his judgement was concerning the ſame things when he purpoſely diſcourſeth of them. For in his Book of the *Unity of the Church*, he uſeth that expreſſion which deſtroys all your ſubordinate union in the *Church*; which is, *Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus à ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur.* They who conſider and underſtand the importance of that ſpeech, will find nothing more deſtructive to your doctrine of the *Catholick Church* than that is. For when he makes the *Univerſal Government* of the *Church* to be but one *Epiſcopal* office, and that committed in the *ſeveral parts* of it with *full power* to *particular Biſhops*, can any be ſo ſenſeleſs to imagine that he ſhould ever think the *Government* of the *Church* in *General* to depend on any one *particular Church* as *chief* over the reſt? And that the former words do really import ſuch a *full power* in *particular Biſhops*, over *that part of the flock which is committed to them*, appears from the true importance of the phraſe *in ſolidum*; a phraſe taken out of the *Civil Law*, where great difference is made between an obligation *in partem* and *in ſolidum*, and ſo proportionable between a tenure *in partem* and *in ſolidum:* thoſe things were held *in ſolidum* which were held *in full right* and *power* without *payments* and *acknowledgments:* but where the *uſus fructus* belonged to *another*, it was not held *in ſolidum.* So that when S. *Cyprian* ſaith, that *every part belonging to each Biſhop was held in ſolidum*, he therein imports that *full right and power* which every *Biſhop* hath *over his charge*; and in this ſpeech he compares the *Government* of the *Church* to an *eſtate* held by ſeveral *Freeholders*, in which every one hath a *full right* to that ſhare which belongs to him. Whereas according to your principles the *Government* of the *Church* is like a *Manor or Lordſhip*, in which the ſeveral *inhabitants* hold at the beſt but by *Copy* from the *Lord*; and you would fain have it *at the will of your Lord too.* But thus far we ſee S. *Cyprian* was from your modern notion of the *Catholick Church*, that he looks on the *Unity* of it as depending

De Unitate Eccleſ. p. 208.

on the consent of the *Catholick Bishops* and *Churches* under their *full power*, and not deriving that *Unity* from any *particular Church* as the *Head* and *Fountain* of it. And therefore in the former *Schism* at *Rome* about *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, St. *Cyprian* imployed two of his *Collegues* thither, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, that not only by the *Letters* they carried, but by their presence and *Counsel* they should do their utmost endeavour *to bring the Members of that divided Body to the Unity of the Catholick Church.* Which is certainly a very different thing from the *Catholick Church's* deriving its *Unity* from the *particular Church of Rome.* Many other Instances of a like nature might be produced out of the *Reports* of St. *Cyprian's* time, but these are sufficient to evidence how far the *Unity of the Catholick Church* was then from depending on the *Church of Rome.*

Ut ad Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent. Cypr. ep. 42.

But, lest we should seem to insist only on St. *Cyprian's* Testimony, it were easie to multiply examples in this kind; which I shall but touch at some of, and proceed. If the *Church of Rome* then had been looked on as the *Center of Ecclesiastical Communion*, is it possible to conceive that the *Excommunications of the Church of Rome* should be slighted as they were by *Polycrates*, for which St. *Hierom* commends him, as a Man of courage? That *Stephen* should be opposed as he was by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* in a way so reflecting on the *Authority* of the *Roman Church?* That *Appeals* to *Rome* should be so severely prohibited by the *African Bishops?* That *Causes* should be determined by so many *Canons* to be heard in their proper Dioceses? That, when the right of *Appeals* was challenged by the *Bishops* of *Rome*, it was wholly upon the account of the imaginary *Nicene Canon?* That, when *Julius* undertook by his *sole Power* to absolve *Athanasius*, the *Oriental Bishops* opposed it as irregular on that account, at the *Council* at *Antioch?* That, when afterwards, *Paulus*, *Marcellus*, and *Lucius* repaired to *Rome* to *Julius*, and he seeks to restore them, the *Eastern Bishops* wonder at his offering to restore them who were excommunicated by themselves? And that as when *Novatus* was excommunicated at *Rome* they opposed it not, so neither ought he to oppose their proceedings against these Persons. What account can be given of these passages, if the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* had depended on the *particular Church of Rome?* Besides, while the *Church* of *Rome* continued regular, we find she looked on her self as much obliged to observe the *Excommunications* made by other *Churches*, as others were to observe hers. As in the case of *Marcion*, who being excommunicated by his *Father* the *Bishop* of *Sinope* in *Pontus*, and by no means prevailing with his *Father* for his admission into the *Church* again; resorts to *Rome*, and with great earnestness begs Admission there, where he received this answer; *That they could not do it without the command of his Father; for there is one Faith and one Consent, and we cannot contradict our worthy Brother, your Father.* This shews the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* to proceed upon other grounds than the *causal influence of the Church of Rome*, when the *consent of the Church* did oblige the *Church of Rome*, not to repeal the *Excommunication* of a *particular Bishop.* Upon which ground it was, that *Synesius* proceeded so high in the *Letters* of Excommunication against *Andronicus*; that

§. 10.

Eusebius histor. Ecclesiastic. lib. 5. cap. 24. *Hieron. de scriptor. Ecclesiast.* To. 1.

Socrat. l. 2. *c.* 5. *Sozom l.* 3. *c.* 5. *Socrat. l.* 2. *c.* 11.

Ὀυ δυνάμεθα ἄνευ τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς τοῦ τιμίου πατρός σου τοῦτο ποιῆσαι· μία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ πίστις, μία ἡ ὁμόνοια, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐναντιωθῆναι τῷ καλῷ συλλειτουργῷ, πατρὶ δὲ σῷ. Epiphanius hæres. 42. Sect. 1.

Ἐι δὲ τις ὡς μικροπολίτην ἀποσκυβαλίσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ δέξεται τοὺς ἀποκηρύκτους αὐτῆς, ὡς οὐκ ἀνάγκη τῇ πένητι πείθεσθαι, ἴσω σχισας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἣν μίαν ὁ χριστὸς εἶναι βούλεται. Synes. epist. 58. p. 203. ed. Petav.

that he forbids *all the Churches upon Earth to receive him into their Communion.* And withal adds, *That if any should contemn his Church because it was of a little City, and should receive those who were condemned by it, as though it were not necessary to obey so poor a Church; he lets them know that they make a Schism in that Church which Christ would have to be one.* We see here, on what equal terms the Communion of the *Catholick Church* then stood: When so *small a Church* as that of *Ptolemais* could so far oblige by her act the *Catholick Church* that they should be guilty of *Schism* who admitted them to Communion whom she had cast out of it. If *Synesius* had believed the *Church of Rome* to have been the *Center of Ecclesiastical Communion*, had it not been *good Manners*, nay *Duty* in him to have asked first the *pleasure* of the *Church of Rome* in this case, before he had passed so full and definitive a Sentence as this was? But the wise and great Men of those Ages were utterly strangers to these rare distinctions of a *causal*, *formal*, and *participative Catholick Church.* It is true indeed they did then speak honourably of the *Church of Rome* in their Age as a principal *Member* of the *Catholick Church*, and having advantages above other *Churches* by its being fixed in the *Seat* of the *Empire*, on which account her Communion was much desired by other Persons. But still we find the Persons most apt to extol her Authority were such as were most *obnoxious*, who not being able to hold any reputation in their own *Churches*, where their Crimes and Scandals were sufficiently known, ran presently to *Rome*, which was ready still to take their part, thereby to inhance her power: As is most evident in the many disputes which arose upon such accounts between the *Roman* and *African Bishops.* But these things we shall have occasion to discuss more particularly afterwards. At the present it may be sufficient by these few (of very many examples which might be produced) to have made it appear, that it was far *from being a known and received truth in the ancient Church, that the Church of* Rome *was the center of Ecclesiastical Communion*, or that *the Church was call'd Catholick from the union with her, and dependence upon her.*

§. 11. But we must now consider what strenuous proofs you produce for so confident an affirmation: Your instances therefore being the most pregnant to your purpose which you could find in *Antiquity* must be particu-
P. 131. larly examined: Your first is of St. *Ambrose*, *relating that his Brother* Satyrus *going on shore in a certain City of* Sardinia (where he desired to be Baptized) *demanded of the Bishop of that City whether he consented with the Catholick Bishops, that is* (saith he) *with the Roman Church.* These words I grant to be in St. *Ambrose*, but whosoever throughly considers them will find how little they make for your purpose. For which it will be sufficient to look on the following words, which tell us, that at that time there was a *Schism* in the *Church*, and *Sardinia* was the chief seat of it. For *Lucifer Caralitanus* had newly separated himself from the *Church*, and had left Societies there which joyned in his *Schism.* For *Caralis* was the Metropolis of *Sardinia*, and it appears by St. *Hierom*, that the *Luciferians* confined the *Church* only to *Sardinia*, which is the cause of that expression of his; *That*

Advocavit ad se Episcopum loci, percontatusque est, utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est, cum Romanâ Ecclesiâ conveniret. D. Ambros. orat. in obit. fratr.

Et forte & ad id locorum in Schismate regionis illius ecclesia erat. Lucifer enim se à nostrâ tunc temporis communione diviserat, & quanquam pro fide exulâsset, & fidei suæ reliquisset hæredes, non putavit tamen fidem esse in Schismate. Id. Ib.

That Christ did not come meerly for the sake of the Sardinians. So that those *Luciferians* were much like the *Donatists*, confining the *Church* only to their own number. Now there being such a *Schism* at that time in *Sardinia*, what did *Satyrus* any more than enquire whether the *Bishop* of the *place* he resorted to was guilty of this *Schism* or no? *But* (say you) *he made that the tryal whether he was a Catholick or no, by asking whether he agreed with the Church of Rome.* To which I answer, that there was very great reason for his particular instancing in the *Church of Rome.* 1. Because *Satyrus* was originally of the *Church of Rome* himself; for *Paulinus* in the Life of St. *Ambrose*, (*Satyrus* his Brother) speaking of him after his Consecration to be *Bishop*, says, *Ad urbem Romam, hoc est ad natale solum perrexit*, *He went to Rome*, i. e. *to the place of his birth*; now *Satyrus* being originally a *Roman*, what wonder is it that he should particularly enquire of the *Roman Church*? As suppose one of the *Gallican Church* of *Arles* or *Vienna* should have been cast upon shore in another *Island* belonging to *France* at the same time, and understanding there was a *Schism* in the place, should particularly enquire whether they agreed with the *Catholick Bishops*, i. e. with the *Church* of *Arles* or *Vienna*, Could you hence infer that either of these were *the Center of Ecclesiastical Communion*, and if not from hence, how can you from the other? Or suppose, in the time of the *Donatists Schism* in *Africk*, a stranger coming accidentally thither and desiring Communion with the *Christians* of that *City* he was in, should enquire of the *Bishop* of the *City* whether he communicated with the *Catholick Bishops*, *i. e.* with the *Church* of *Hippo* or *Carthage*, Could you hence infer that *Hippo* was *causally the Catholick Church*, and if not, with what reason can you do it from so parallel a case? 2. Because *Sardinia* did belong to the *Metropolitan Province* of the *Church* of *Rome*; it being one of the *Suburbicarian Provinces* under the jurisdiction of the *Roman Lieutenant*, and consequently one of the *Suburbicarian Churches* appertaining to the *Metropolitan Power* of the *Bishop of Rome:* And therefore it was but reason to ask whether the *Churches* in *Sardinia* did agree with their *Mother Church* or no. But all this is very far from implying that the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* comes from the particular *Church of Rome:* On this account, because at that time when the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* was preserved by that continual *Correspondence* between the parts of it by the *formed letters* and otherwise, whoever was known to have Communion with any one particular Church (which Communicated with the rest) had thereby Communion with the *Catholick Church.* So that on that account the question might as well have been asked of the *Churches* of *Milan*, *Agobio*, or any other in *Italy* as of the *Church of Rome.* For whosoever communicated with any of them did communicate with the *Catholick Church*, as well as those who did communicate with the *Church of Rome.* So that your first instance will prove no more the *Church of Rome* to be the *fountain* and *center* of *Ecclesiastical Communion*, than any other particular Church. Your second is, from St. *Herom's* saying, *That the Church of* Alexandria *made it her glory to participate of the Roman Faith.* But doth it hence follow that the *Church* of *Alexandria* was therefore *Catholick*, because she participated of the *Faith* of the *Roman Church* considered as a particular Church? For, any one who reads that *Epistle* will easily see, that St. *Herom* there speaks of the *Roman Faith*, not as it *proceeds* from the *Roman Church*, but as it was *received* by it; and that he doth not understand it of the then *present Roman*

Nec ob Sardorum tantum Mastrucam Dei Filium descendisse. Hieron. c. Lucifer. init. *Mastruca vestis Barbaricæ genus, quam Sardi suâ linguâ Mastrucam appellant: Significans multos adhuc superesse bonos Christianos, etiamsi nulli essent in Sardinia, in quâ solâ ille Christi ecclesiam esse volebat.* Erasmus in Scholiis.

Sed tu scito, &c. Romanam fidem Apostolico ore laudatam, cujus se esse participem Alexandrina Ecclesia gloriatur. Hieron. ep. 68. ad Theophil.

nian Faith, any further than it agreed with that *Faith* which the *Apoſtle* commended in them. So that the utmoſt which can be extracted out of this Teſtimony, is, that it was the *glory* of the *Church* of *Alexandria* to hold the ſame *Faith* which the Primitive *Roman Church* did, for which the *Apoſtle* commended it. Which is apparent by the deſign of the whole *Epiſtle*, which is to encourage *Theophilus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* to ſuppreſs the *Nefarious Hereſie* (as he calls it) of the *Origeniſts*; for, it ſeems, *Theophilus* then dealt more mildly with them, which *Hierom* was diſpleaſed at. And therefore tells him, that although he took ſome care by the diſcipline of the *Church* to reduce them, yet that was not enough, and thence brings in theſe words; *But withal know, that nothing is more our deſign than to preſerve the Rights of Chriſt, and not to tranſgreſs the bounds of our Fathers, and always to remember the Roman Faith, commended by the mouth of the Apoſtle, which is the glory of the Church of* Alexandria *that ſhe is a partaker of.* If you had dealt ſo fairly as to have cited St. *Hierom*'s words at large, any one might eaſily ſee how remote they were from your purpoſe; it being manifeſt by them, that St. *Hierom*'s only deſign was; To perſwade *Theophilus* to aſſert the ancient *Faith* againſt the incroachments of modern Hereſies; and, to incourage him to it, mentions that commendation which was given to the *ancient Faith* by the *Apoſtle* writing to the *Romans* upon their receiving it; and therefore ſince the ſame *Faith* was in the *Church* of *Alexandria* which the *Romans* were commended for receiving of, *Theophilus* ought to be a vigorous aſſertor of *it*, againſt the oppoſitions of *Hereticks*. But how from hence we ſhould infer that the *Church* of *Rome* was the *fountain* of *Faith* as well *as center of Communion*, is a thing we are yet to ſeek for, till you further direct us. Yet, it may be, the ſtrength of it lies in this, *That the Roman Faith was commended by the Apoſtle.* And was not the Faith of other *Churches* where it was pure, commended as well as that? And although the *Fathers* in their complemental addreſſes to the *Church* of *Rome* were pleaſed often to mention this, *That the Roman Faith was praiſed by the Apoſtle*; yet, as *Rigaltius* well obſerves, *That the Latin Fathers took thoſe words of the Apoſtle, as though their Faith were more pure and ſincere than in other places; whereas the Apoſtle only ſaith, that he gave thanks to God that there was ſuch a fame abroad, that the Romans who ſwayed the World, had embraced the Chriſtian Faith. Which by reaſon of the dignity of the City which was head of the World, and empreſs of Nations, did conduce much to the propagation of the Chriſtian Faith.* For that there was no peculiar excellency in the *Roman Faith* above the Faith of other *Churches*, appears from the *ſcope* of this *Epiſtle* which was to inſtruct and ſettle them in the right Faith, and *from* the *Teſtimonies* of the *Author* of the *Commentaries* under St. *Ambroſe*'s name, and St. *Hierom* himſelf. The former tells us, the reaſon why St. *Paul* commended their Faith, was *Becauſe though they ſaw no miracles yet they believed, though not ſo purely as they ought to have done.* And afterwards ſaith, *That S.* Paul *commends their Faith although it were not exact according to rule, yet ſince by that they came to worſhip God in Chriſt he rejoyceth in it, knowing they might increaſe more in it.* And St. *Hierom* elſewhere ſpeaking without deſign or intereſt,

Sed tamen ſcito, nobis nihil eſſe antiquius quàm Chriſti jura ſervare, nec patrum tranſire terminos, ſemperque meminiſſe Romanam fidem Apoſtolico ore laudatam, cujus ſe eſſe participem Alexandrina Eccleſia gloriatur. Heron. Theoph. Tom. 2. p. 110. ed. Chevall. 1533.

Sic omnes ferè Latini Patres, Pauli ad Romanos verba accepêrunt, quaſi rectior & ſincerior fuiſſet apud Romanos fides: cum hoc tantum dicat Apoſtolus; agere ſe gratias Deo, quod ubique paſſim fama ſit, etiam Romanos rerum Dominos, fidem Chriſtianam ſuſcepiſſe. Quod certe ob dignitatem Urbis quæ totius orbis erat caput & gentium Domina, valdè ad fidei Chriſtianæ propagationem conducebat. Rigaltius Obſervat. ad Cyprian. epiſt. p. 78.

Quia nulla vitutum virdentes inſignia, ſuſceperunt fidem Chriſti, quamvis corrupto ſenſu. Ambroſ. præfat. in epiſt. ad Roman.

Quamvis non ſecundum regulam ab autoribus traditæ veritatis, tamen quia quod ab uno Deo erat, interpoſito nomine Chriſti, cœperant venerari, gratulatur; ſciens illos poſſe proficere. Id. ad. v. 8. c. 1.

reſt ſaith, *Not that the Romans have any other kind of Faith than what all other Churches have; but that there was greater devotion and ſimplicity in believing.* And withall adds, that the very ſame faults which the *Apoſtles* condemned them for then, did continue ſtill among them, the greateſt of which was *Pride.* And if this preſent Controverſie do not make good S. *Hierom*'s obſervation till this time, we are ſtrangely miſtaken: for what greater *Pride* can there be, than for any *particular Church* to arrogate the title of *Catholick* to her ſelf, and to make all others no farther *Catholick* than they participate of her Faith and Communion?

Non quod aliam habeant Romani fidem, niſi hanc quam omnes Chriſti Eccleſiæ; ſed quod devotio in eis major ſit & ſimplicitas ad credendum. Hieron. præfat. in l. 2. comment. in epiſt. ad Galat. Tom. 9.

Your next Teſtimony is that of *John*, the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, who did in his Epiſtle to *Hormiſda*, *judge thoſe to be ſevered from the communion of the Catholick Church, who did not conſent in all things with the See Apoſtolick:* but the main force of your teſtimonies lies in a preſumption that Men will never take the pains to examine them. We muſt therefore conſider the occaſion and manner of the writing this *Epiſtle*; for thoſe words you cite, are not the words of the *Patriarch* himſelf, but of the form of *ſubſcription* required by *Hormiſda* in order to an *Union* of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*; which had been then a long time in a *Schiſm.* For after that *Acacius* ſtood up ſo reſolutely in defence of the *rights* of his *See* at *Conſtantinople*, the *Roman* Biſhops (who made it then their deſign to infringe the *liberties* of other *Churches* the better to inhance their own) would by no means admit of any reconciliation, unleſs the names of *Acacius*, and thoſe who defended him in that *See* being his Succeſſors, as *Phravita*, *Euphemius*, *Macedonius*, &c. were expunged out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*; which being ſo unjuſt and unreaſonable a demand, for a long time the *Patriarchs* of *Conſtantinople* would by no means aſſent to it. But after the death of the *Emperour Anaſtaſius*, *Juſtine* ſucceeds in the throne, one who made it his buſineſs to have this *breach* made up; in order to which he writes to *Hormiſda*, and earneſtly perſwades him to a reconciliation; and ſo likewiſe doth the *Patriarch John.* But it hath been the common practice of the *Biſhops* of that *Church*, to be therein unlike the *unjuſt Judge*, that they will not be wrought on by *importunities*; but have been the more implacable, the more they have been ſought to: as it appeared in this preſent caſe. For this ſoure and inflexible *Pope* would not yield to any terms of *Union*, but upon conditions of his own preſcribing, which were, the *expunging* of *Acacius*, and *ſubſcribing* that *form* which he ſent to them. Which when the *Emperor* and *Patriarch* ſaw, though they were ſufficiently diſpleaſed at it, yet out of their greedy deſire of peace, they were contented rather to *ſwallow* theſe hard conditions than ſuffer the *Schiſm* to remain ſtill. Now it is in this *form* of *ſubſcription* that theſe words are contained, wherein they promiſe, *not to recite the names of thoſe in the ſacred myſteries, who were ſevered from the communion of the Catholick Church*, i. e. *who conſent not in all things with the See Apoſtolick.* But leſt theſe words being thus inſerted by the *Pope* himſelf, ſhould be interpreted to the diſadvantage of other *Churches*, and particularly that of *Conſtantinople*; The *Patriarch* makes a Preface to that *Subſcription* by way of *Proteſtation*; wherein after declaring the reception of the *Pope*'s *letters*, and congratulating the hopes of *Union*, he manifeſts his own deſire of peace, and his willingneſs to refuſe the communion of

§. 12. *Concil. Tom.* 3. *p.* 767.

all Hereticks. *For*, ſaith he, *I look on thoſe moſt holy Churches of your elder and our new* Rome, *as both making but one Church.* And after, declaring his aſſent to the degrees of the four *General Councils*, he adds, *That thoſe who oppoſed them he judged fallen off, à Sanctâ Dei generali & Apoſtolicâ Eccleſiâ*, from the holy *Catholick and Apoſtolick Church.*

Sanctiſſimas enim Dei Eccleſias, i. e. *ſuperioris veſtræ, & novellæ iſtius Romæ unam eſſe accipio, illam ſedem Apoſtoli Petri, & illius Auguſtæ civitatis unam eſſe definio.* Joh. Patriarch. ep. inter ep. Hormiſd. 35.

Now when the *Patriarch* was thus careful to explain himſelf, ſo as to aſſert that the *Church* of *Rome*, and that of *Conſtantinople*, made but one *Church*, when he adds what he means by the *Catholick Church*, viz. *the truly General and Apoſtolical Church*; infer as much from *Hormiſda*'s words as you will, I am ſure you can do little to your purpoſe from the *Patriarchs*, taking them in the ſenſe he explains himſelf in, by this *Proteſtation.* So that the meaning of them is only this, that as he judged the *Church of Rome* a member of the *Catholick Church* (whoſe *Unity* required, that thoſe who were out of communion in one *Church* ſhould be ſo with the reſt) ſo he conſented to acknowledge them juſtly *excommunicated* whom the *Church of Rome* would have to be ſo. So that hence nothing ariſeth to your purpoſe, more than will equally advance the authority of any other particular *Church*; whoſe excommunications did oblige the *whole Church*, as we have ſeen already in the caſe of *Sinope* and *Ptolemais*.

§. 13. You proceed to another Teſtimony of S. *Auſtin* addreſſing himſelf to the *Donatiſts*, telling them, *That the ſucceſſion of the Roman Biſhops is the rock which the proud gates of Hell overcome not, thereby inſinuating, that the very ſucceſſion of thoſe Biſhops is in ſome true ſenſe the Catholick Church.* But from whence doth it appear that the ſucceſſion of the *Roman Biſhops* is the *Rock* here ſpoken of? For S. *Auſtin* was there arguing againſt the *Donatiſts* and ſhewing them the danger of being ſeparated from the unity of the *Catholick Church*; that if they were cut off from the *vine*, *they would wither and be in danger to be caſt into the fire*; and therefore exhorts them, *to come and be planted into the vine, it being a grief to them to ſee them cut off.* Now in order to this, he brings in the former words to acquaint them with the way, whereby they might better underſtand the *Catholick Church*, which could not in reaſon be confined to their own *age*, but muſt be derived from the *Apoſtles.* So that his counſel is of the ſame nature with that of *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*, who put Men upon a diligent ſearch into the *ſucceſſions* of the *Apoſtolical Churches.* But now when by this ſearch they have found out the *Catholick Church*, he tells them, *That is the Rock which the proud gates of Hell cannot overcome.* For ſo elſewhere S. *Auſtin* calls the *Catholick Church* a *Rock*, as he calls it likewiſe a *Houſe*, and a *City*, in ſeveral places of theſe *diſputations* againſt the *Donatiſts.* As here before he calls it the *Vine*, *from whence all who are cut off, wither and dye:* But what is all this to the particular *Church of Rome:* which none of the *Diſputes* with the *Donatiſts* at all concerned? As is fully manifeſt from the whole management of that Controverſie; in which tho' he was ſo much put upon ſhewing what and where the *Catholick Church* was, yet he never once expreſſed any ſuch thing, as that the *Church* was called *Catholick* from any relation to the *Church of Rome*, but ſtill mentions it as a particular *Church*, which with other *Churches* made up one *Catholick Church.* So in his *Commen-*

Numerate ſacerdotes vel ab ipſâ ſede Petri & in ordine illo Patrum quis cui ſucceſſit videte. Ipſa eſt Petra quam non vincunt ſuperbæ Inferorum Portæ. D. Aug. in Pſalm. C. part. Donat. Tom. 7. col. 9.

Venite fratres, ſi vultis ut inſeramini in vite: Dolor eſt cum vos videmus præciſos ita jacere.

Tertul. de præſcript. c. 36. Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

Auguſt. de baptiſm. c. Donatiſt. l. 3. c. 18. l. 4 c. 12. l. 7. c. 51. Adverſ. Petilian. l. 2. c. 70. De unitat. Eccleſ. cap. 20.

Commentaries on the 44th *Pſalm: Behold* Rome, ſaith he, *behold* Carthage, *behold ſeveral other Cities; theſe are Kings daughters and have delighted the King in his honour, but they all make up but one Queen.* How incongruous had this expreſſion been, had S. *Auſtin* believed the *Roman Church* to be ſo much above all others, that the ground why any others were called *Catholick*, was from their union with her; and therefore he muſt according to your principles have ſaluted the *Church of Rome* as the *Queen* of all the reſt, and made other particular *Churches* but as her *daughters* and *hand-maids.* But S. *Auſtin* knew of no ſuch difference, but looked on all particular *Churches*, whether at *Rome*, *Carthage* or elſewhere, as making up but one *Catholick Church.* And to the ſame purpoſe he frequently ſpeaks, when he ſaies, *That the Church is call'd One in regard of her Unity, and Many in regard of the ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians abroad in the world*; When he calls the ſeveral *Churches*, *members of that one Church which is ſpread all over the world*, without ſetting any note of diſcrimination upon one above all the reſt; When he reckons the *Roman*, *Corinthian*, *Galatian*, *Epheſian Churches* together, and that all theſe and the *Churches* propagated from them, do conſpire in one *Univerſal Church.* But the places are ſo many to this purpoſe in him, that it would look too much like oſtentation to offer to prove a matter ſo evident to all that read any thing in him. And is it poſſible then for you to think *That S.* Auſtin *made the ſucceſſion of Biſhops at* Rome *in any ſenſe the Catholick Church?* You might as well ſay, that he made the *Church* ſpread all over the world a *particular Church*, as that he made any *particular Church* whether at *Rome* or elſewhere (for he makes no difference) to be in any ſenſe the *Univerſal Church.*

Ecce Roma, ecce Carthago, ecce aliæ & aliæ civitates: filiæ Regum ſunt, & delectaverunt Regem ſuum in hon re ipſius; & ex omnibus ſit una quædam Regina. Aug. in Pſ. 44. p. 282. ed. Froben.

Propter unitatem Eccleſiæ, una Eccleſia; propter congregationes fraternas per loca multæ ſunt Eccleſiæ. Id. in Pſal. 141.

An placet vobis, ut contra Eccleſias quæ membra ſunt unius Eccleſiæ toto orbe diffuſæ, &c. Id. de Unitat. Eccleſ. c. 11.

Verum etiam illas Eccleſias ſuas in Scripturis Apoſtolicis & Canonicis pariter legimus non ſolum Romanorum, verum etiam Corinthiorum, Galatarum, Epheſiorum, &c. *Ut taceam de aliis tam latis atq; univerſis terrarum partibus, in quas ex his Apoſtolicis laboribus & plantationibus porrecta crevit, & creſcit Eccleſia* Id. c. Creſcon. Grammat. l. 2. c. 37.

§. 14.] But that which you ſeem to lay the greateſt force on, is the teſtimony of *Optatus Milevitanus*, *Who*, ſay you, *after he had ſaid that S.* Peter *was* Ibid. *head of all the Apoſtles; and that he would have been a Schiſmatick, who ſhould have erected another chair againſt that ſingular one of S.* Peter, *as alſo that in that chair of S.* Peter *being but one, Unity was to be kept by all; he adds that with* Siricius *then Pope he himſelf was united in communion, with whom the whole world (ſaith he, meaning the whole Catholick Church) agrees by communicatory letters in one Society of communion; See here* (ſay you) *how clearly he makes the union with the Biſhop of* Rome *the meaſure of the Catholick Church; which the Biſhop calls a Jeſuitiſm, and further proves himſelf to be in the Catholick Church, becauſe he was in communion with the See of S.* Peter. For our better underſtanding the meaning of theſe words of *Optatus*, we muſt conſider the ſtate of the Controverſie between *Optatus* and *Parmenianus*, by which it will appear, how very little theſe words of his make to your purpoſe. The main queſtion between the *Catholicks* and the *Donatiſts* was, about the *Catholick Church*, To whom it was that title did belong. The difficulty ſeemed the greater, becauſe there was no difference between them in any matter of *Faith*, or in the ſubſtance of the *Sacraments*, and therefore they were fain to find out other means to decide this Controverſie, than by either of thoſe two. For which the *Catholicks* made choice of theſe two arguments *Univerſality* and *Succeſſion*, the former as agreeing with that large *ſpread* of the *Church* which was Propheſied to be in the times of the *Goſpel*, whereas the *Donatiſts* confined the *Church* to a Corner in *Africa*:

the latter in regard of the neceſſity of deriving themſelves from the *Apoſtolical Churches*. Now the *Donatiſts* denying any but themſelves to be the *Catholick Church*, the proof lay on their *Adverſaries* part, who upon all occaſions offer to make it good, That the *Church* from which the *Donatiſts* ſeparated themſelves, was the only *true* and *Catholick Church*. Accordingly *Optatus* having in the firſt book diſcuſſed the matters of *fact* about the riſe of the *Schiſm*, the ordinations of *Cecilian* and *Majorinus*, and the proceedings uſed for the ending the *Schiſm*, in this ſecond Book, he enters on the Controverſie of the *Church* which *Parmenianus* would have to be only among themſelves; againſt which he urgeth firſt, that then certainly the *Church* could not be called *Catholick*, becauſe it was ſo called *from its large comprehenſion and univerſal ſpread*. Had *Optatus* believed the ground of the *Churches* being *Catholick* had been its union with the *Church* of *Rome*, he would never have given that account of its being *called ſo*, which here he doth. After which he produceth many places of *Scripture* to prove the large *extent* of the *Church*, and concludes, *That to be the Catholick Church which was diffuſed over all the world*, than which nothing can be more contrary to your pretenſions, who limit and confine the *Catholick Church* to your own party as the *Donatiſts* did. And if thoſe arguments then uſed againſt the *Donatiſts* had any force againſt them, they have ſtill as much againſt you, who exclude ſo great and conſiderable *Churches* from being members of the *Catholick Church* becauſe not of your communion. From hence *Optatus* proceeds to examine, Which had the better title to be the *Catholick Church* on the account of *Succeſſion*; and *Parmenianus* reckoning the *Cathedra* in the firſt of the *dotes Eccleſiæ*, *Optatus* begins with that by which is underſtood the *lawful derivation of power for governing the Church*, ſo *Albaſpinæus*, (as well as others) underſtands it. Now the Controverſie was, where this *Cathedra* was. *Optatus* proves, *there can be no lawful power but what is derived from the Apoſtles*, and therefore where the *ſucceſſion* is plain and uninterrupted, there and no where elſe can that *Cathedra* be. *Which Epiſcopal chair being firſt placed at* Rome *by S.* Peter, *in which he as chief of the Apoſtles ſate, from whence he had his name* Cephas; *in which one chair Unity ſhould be kept by all; leſt the other Apoſtles ſhould ſet up others againſt it; ſo that he muſt be a ſchiſmatick and offender, who ſhould place another chair againſt that. Therefore in this one chair S.* Peter *ſate firſt, to whom ſucceeded* Linus, *to him* Clemens *and ſo on to* Syricius *who joyns with us, with whom the whole world communicates by the entercourſe of formed letters. Do you now give an account of your chair, who challenge to your ſelves the name of the Holy Church.* To paſs by that ridiculous account of the name *Cephas*, which *Baldwin* ſuppoſes to be inſerted into the text from ſome ignorant gloſs made in the margin, the main thing to be conſidered, is the ſcope and deſign of theſe words; in which he doth two things, 1. He ſhews the evident ſucceſſion of the *Catholick Biſhops* from S. *Peter* in the *Church of Rome*, which he doth by a diſtinct and particular enumeration of them. 2. From thence ſhews the unlawfulneſs of ſetting up another *chair* in oppoſition to that, *i. e.* pretending to another right of *Government* than what was conveyed

Ubi ergo erit proprietas Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta ſit Catholica, quod ſit rationabilis & ubiq; diffuſa? Optat. l. 2.

Cathedram Epiſcopalem, primam miſſionem, omnem poteſtatem, à quâ cæteræ deducerentur. Albaſpinæus in Optat. lib. 2.

Igitur negare non potes, ſcire te in urbe Româ Petro primo Cathedram Epiſcopalem eſſe collatam; in quâ ſederit omnium Apoſtolorum caput Petrus; inde & cephas appellatus eſt; in quâ unâ Cathedrâ, unitas ab omnibus ſervaretur, nè cæteri Apoſtoli ſingulas ſibi quiſque defenderent: ut jam Schiſmaticus & peccator eſſet, qui contra ſingularem Cathedram, alteram collocaret. Ergo Cathedra unica quæ eſt prima de dotibus, ſedit prior Petrus: Cui ſucceſſit Linus, Lino Clemens, &c. Damaſo Siricius hodie, qui noſter eſt Socius: Cum quo totus orbis commercio formatarum in unâ communionis ſocietate concordat. Veſtræ Cathedræ vos originem reddite, qui vobis vultis ſanctam Eccleſiam vendicare. Optatus l. 2. *Sed ſuſpicor hæc verba (unde Cephat appellatus eſt) eſſe ineptæ alicujus gloſſæ ad marginem temerè aſcriptæ, & deinde abs librariis contextui inſertæ.* Balduin. in Optat. l. 2.

veyed down from the *Apoſtles*; or ſetting up another *Chair* in oppoſition to that of St. *Peter* at *Rome*, *i. e.* that ſucceſſion of *Biſhops* which was derived from him. Now, ſaith he, God providing for the Unity of the *Church*, intended there ſhould be but one *Chair* in a place, *i. e.* that the ſeveral *Apoſtles* ſhould not in the ſame *place* ſet up a diſtinct *Cathedra* or *ſucceſſion* of *Church-Governours*; and therefore though St. *Paul* as well as St. *Peter* were inſtrumental in the ſettling the *Church of Rome*, yet, that the *Churches Unity* might be preſerved, there were not two diſtinct *ſeries* of *Biſhops*, the one deriving from St. *Peter*, and the other from St. *Paul*. So that *Optatus* his ſaying is much of the ſame nature with that of *Cyprian* in the caſe of the *Schiſm* about *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, who urgeth that moſt, *That there ought to be but one Biſhop in one Church*, now the *Biſhop* and his *Cathedra* are *correlates* to each other. *Optatus* therefore ſaying that there was but *one Cathedra* at *Rome*, puts the *Donatiſts* upon this iſſue, that if they could not deduce their *ſucceſſion* from St. *Peter* at *Rome*, they could have no pretence to the *Cathedra* there. And therefore challengeth them to deduce the *Succeſſion* of their *Biſhops* there, as at large appears in his following diſcourſe. Which could be no higher than of *Macrobius* from *Encolpius*, *Encolpius* from *Bonifacius Ballitanus*, as he from *Victor Garbienſis*, who was ſent over on purpoſe from the *Donatiſts* in *Africk* to make a faction and a party at *Rome*, among the *African Inhabitants* there. Now this being the utmoſt *ſucceſſion* they could pretend to, and that being in oppoſition to that *ſucceſſion* which was derived from St. *Peter*, nothing could be more plain than that at *Rome* (about which the Conteſt was) the *Cathedra* could not belong to the *Donatiſts* but their *Adverſaries*; and therefore that being by *Parmenianus* acknowledged one of the *Dowries* of the *Catholick Church*, the title of that could not belong to the *Donatiſts* but their oppoſers. This therefore doth not at all concern *Romes* being *cauſally the Catholick Church*, but is only produced as a particular *Church* for a *known inſtance* whereby to decide this particular Controverſie of ſucceſſion. For otherwiſe the Argument would have held as well for any other *Apoſtolical Church* where the Succeſſion was clear: And therefore afterwards he makes the *Communion with the ſeven Churches as plain an argument of communion with the Catholick, as he doth here of the Church of* Rome. You may therefore every jot as well make the *ſeven Churches* of *Aſia*, to be *cauſally the Catholick Church*, as the *Church* of *Rome*. And to the ſame purpoſe he inſtanceth *in the Corinthian, Theſſalonian, Galatian Churches*, as he doth in that of *Rome*, or the *ſeven Churches*. We ſee then, *Optatus* his deſign was to ſhew that their *Church* from which the *Donatiſts* ſeparated, was the true *Catholick Church*, which he proves from their *Communion* with all the *Apoſtolical Churches*, which had a clear and diſtinct ſucceſſion from the *Apoſtles* their planters. And becauſe of the *Vicinity* and *Fame* of *Rome*, and the eaſier knowing the ſucceſſion there, he inſtanceth in *that* in the firſt place, and then proceeds to the reſt of them. But withal, to ſhew the *Unity* of all theſe *Apoſtolical Churches*, when he had mentioned *Siricius* as the preſent *Biſhop* of *Rome*, he adds, *That all the world agreed with him in the entercourſe of the formed Letters*; not thereby intimating any *ſupremacy* of that *Church* above others, but to ſhew that that ſucceſſion he inſtanceth in at *Rome*, was of the *Catholick Church*, becauſe the *whole Chriſtian World*, did agree in *Communion* with him that was the *Biſhop* there. And when he

Ubi ſedit victor Garbienſis, à veſtris jam dudum de Africâ ad paucos erraticos miſſus, &c. Optatus ibid.

Extra ſeptem Eccleſias quicquid foris eſt, alienum eſt. Id. ib.

Tibi unitas diſplicet; hoc ſi crimen putas, argue nos Theſſalonicenſibus, Corinthiis, Galatis, ſeptem Eccleſiis quæ ſunt in Aſia, communicâſſe. Ibid.

Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas apud quas ipsæ nunc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsidentur. Tertul. præscript. ad hæret. cap. 36.
Euseb. hist. Eccles. l. 7. c. 32.

he speaks of *one Chair*, it is plain, he means it of the particular *Church* of *Rome*, because every *Apostolical Church* had an *Apostolical Chair* belonging to it. So *Tertullian* expressly, *That in all the Apostolical Churches there were their Chairs still remaining.* And *Eusebius* particularly mentions the *Apostolical Throne* or *Chair* at *Hierusalem*, as others do that of *Mark* at *Alexandria*, and of the rest elsewhere. Nothing then can possibly be inferred from these words of *Optatus* concerning the *Church* of *Rome*, but what would equally hold for any other *Apostolical Church*, and how much that is, let the Reader judge: And how much soever it be, it will be very little for your advantage, who pretend to something *peculiar* to the *Church* of *Rome* above all other *Churches*.

§. 15. Ibid.

From *Optatus* you proceed, or rather return to St. *Hierom*, *who*, (say you) *professes the Church is built upon St.* Peter's *See, and that whoever eats the Lamb, that is, pretends to believe in Christ, and partakes of the Sacraments out of that house, that is, out of the Communion of that Church, is prophane, and an Alien; yea, that he belongs to Antichrist, and not to Christ, whoever consents not with the successor of St.* Peter. This Testimony sounds big and high at first, and I shall not impute these expressions either to St. *Hierom*'s *heat*, or his *flattery*, although it looks the more suspicious, because at that time he had so great a *Pique* against the *Eastern Bishops*, and that these words are contained in a complemental Address to *Damasus*. But, setting aside what advantages might be gained on that account, to weaken the *force* of this *Testimony*, if we consider the occasion or nature of these expressions, we shall find that they reach not the purpose you design them for. We must therefore consider, that at the time of the writing this *Epistle*, St. *Hierom* seems to be in a great perplexity what to do in that division which was then in the *Church* of *Antioch*, concerning *Paulinus*, *Vitalis*, and *Miletius*; but besides this *Schism*, it seems St. *Hierom* suspected some remainders of *Arrianism* to be still among them; from their *demanding* of him, Whether he acknowledged three distinct *Hypostases* in the *Trinity*.

Ego nullum primum (præmium fortasse rectius) nisi Christum sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est Cathedræ Petri communione conjocior. Super illam Petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio. Quicunq; extra hanc domum Agnum comederit, profanus est.. Quicunq; tecum non colligit, spargit, hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. Hieron. ep. 57. ad Damas.

Theodoret. l. 2. c 8.

Now St. *Hierom* by *hypostasis* understands the *essence*, as many of the *Greek Fathers* did; and thence the *Sardican Council* defined, *That there was but one hypostasis of the Father, Son, and Spirit*; and therefore he suspects, that when they require of him the acknowledgment of *three hypostases*, they might design to entrap him, and unawares betray him into *Arrianism*. And therefore argues stifly in the remainder of that *Epistle*, that *hypostasis* properly signifies *essence*, and nothing else; and from thence urgeth the inconvenience of admitting the terms of three *hypostases*. Now St. *Hierom* being thus set upon by these *Eastern Bishops*, he keeps off from Communion with them, and adviseth with the *Ægyptian Confessors*, and follows them at present; but having received his *Baptism* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and being looked on as a *Roman* where he was, he thought it necessary to address himself to *Pope Damasus*, to know what he should do in this case. And the rather, because if St. *Hierom* had consented with them, they would have looked on it as an evidence of the agreement of the *Roman Church* with them. Therefore he so earnestly and importunately writes to *Damasus* concerning it, as being originally part of his charge, having been *Baptized* in that *Church*.

Tota secularium literarum Schola nihil aliud hypostasin nisi οὐσίαν novit. Id. ib.

Inde nunc meæ animæ postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi. Ib.
Ab Arrianorum præsulæ & Campensibus, novellum à me homine Romano nomen exigitur. Ib.

But (ſay you) *whatever the occaſion of the words were, Is it not plain, that he makes the Church to be built on St.* Peter's *See, and that whoſoever is out of the Communion of that Church, is an Alien, and belongs to Antichriſt?* To that therefore I anſwer, 1. That he doth not ſay, that the *Catholick Church* is built on the particular *Church* of *Rome*: For it is not, *ſuper hanc Petram*, as referring to the *Cathedra* immediately preceding; but, *ſuper illam*, and therefore it is not improbably ſuppoſed by ſome, that the *Rock* here refers to *Chriſt*. And, although *Eraſmus* doth imagine, that ſome particular *privilege* and *dignity* did belong to *Rome* above other *Churches* from this place, (which is not the thing we contend about) yet withal he ſays, that by the *Rock* we muſt not underſtand *Rome*; for *that may degenerate: But we muſt underſtand that Faith which* Peter *profeſſed*. And it is a much eaſier matter for *Marianus Victorius*, to tell him, *he lyes*, as he doth here in plain terms, than to be able to confute what he ſaith. And that the rather, becauſe he begins his Diſcourſe in that manner, *Ego nullum primum niſi Chriſtum ſequens*, whereby he attributes the *ſupream Power*, and infallible judgment in the *Church* only to *Chriſt*. For, as for your learned correction of *præmium* for *primum*, though you follow *Cardinal Perron* in it, yet it is without any probability at all, it being contrary to all the *MSS.* uſed by *Eraſmus*, *Victorius*, *Gravius*, *Poſſevin*, and others; and hath no authority to vouch it, but only *Gratian*, who is condemned by your own Writers, for a falſifier and corrupter of Authors.

Non ſuper Romam arbitror, nam fieri poteſt ut Roma degeneret, ſed ſuper illam fidem quam Petrus profeſſus eſt. Eraſmus in Schol. *Et ſi non minus aliis eam laborâſſe, Eraſmus hic mentiatur.* Mar. Victor. Schol. in ep. 57.

2. I anſwer, when St. *Hierom* pronounces *thoſe Aliens and Prophane, who are out of the Communion of the Church*; either it belongs not to the particular *Church* of *Rome*, or, if it doth, it makes not much for your purpoſe. 1. There is no certainty that he there ſpeaks of the *particular Church* of *Rome*, but that he rather ſpeaks of the true *Univerſal Church*; for it is plain, he ſpeaks of that *Church which is built upon the Rock:* Now by your own confeſſion, that cannot be the *Church* of *Rome*, for that you ſuppoſe to be the *Rock* it ſelf, *viz.* the *See* of *Peter*, and therefore the *Church* built upon it, muſt be the *Univerſal Church*. And that this muſt be his meaning, appears from his plain words, for he ſaith, *Upon that Rock the Church is built, and whoſoever eats the Lamb without this houſe, is prophane*; — he cannot certainly mean, *Whoſoever eats without the Rock*, but *without the Houſe built upon it*; ſo that the *houſe* in the latter *clauſe* muſt needs be the ſame with that *which was built on the Rock* in the former. Either therefore you muſt deny the *See of Peter* to be the *Rock*, or you muſt of neceſſity aſſert the *houſe built upon it* to be the *Univerſal Church*, and not the particular one of *Rome*; and conſequently the danger lies not upon Mens not being in Communion with the *Roman*, but with the *truly Catholick Church*. And how from hence you will infer, *That they are prophane who are out of the Roman Church*; it would be worth our while to underſtand. 2. Suppoſe I ſhould grant, that St. *Hierom* did mean the particular *Church* of *Rome*, yet I am not ſatisfied, that this comes home to your purpoſe, unleſs you could prove, that St. *Hierom* ſpake of what was neceſſarily and unalterably to be in the *Church* of *Rome*, and not meerly of what was in that time, when he ſpake theſe words. But that is your perpetual *Paralogiſm* in the citations of the *Fathers*, in praiſe of the *Church* of *Rome*, what they ſpake, and it may be deſervedly of the *Church* of their own time (although ſometimes their *Rhetorick* ſwell'd too high in their *Encomiaſticks*) that you will needs have to be underſtood of the ſame *Church* at all times, and in our preſent Age. As though it were not poſſible for a *Church* to be eminent for *purity* of *Do-*

Ctrine

Ctrine in one Age, and to decline as much from it in another. But I need give no other inſtance in this caſe, than St. *Hierom* himſelf, for if we believe St. *Hierom* in his *Catalogue*, *the two immediate predeceſſors of* Damaſus, *in the See of* Rome, Liberius, *and* Felix *were tainted with Hereſie*; and that very *Hereſie*, *viz. Arrianiſm*, which St. *Hierom* writes to *Damaſus* about now. I pray, tell us then, Whether if St. *Hierom* had lived in *Liberius* his time, would he have writ to him after the ſame rate he now writes to *Damaſus*; if he had been of the ſame mind then, he would have been ſo far from ſcrupling the three *hypoſtaſes*, that he muſt have ſubſcribed the *Arrian confeſſion*, as St. *Hierom* tells us, *Liberius* did, through the inſtigation of *Fortunatianus*. And therefore to let us ſee, on what account he was now ſo liberal in his commendations of the *Church* of *Rome*, he begins this *Epiſtle* with the praiſe *of her preſent Orthodoxneſs in the Catholick Faith*, *And that amongſt all the diviſions and breaches of the Eaſtern Churches*, *they preſerved the Faith of their Fore-fathers entire*. *That now the Sun of Righteouſneſs ariſes in the Weſt*; *but that Lucifer*, *who fell*, *now reigns in the Eaſt*; with many expreſſions to the ſame purpoſe. Which ſuppoſition being granted true at that time, that which follows infers very little to your purpoſe, unleſs you can prove, that what was ſo then, muſt neceſſarily continue ſo in all ages. If the *Eaſt* was then corrupted, and the *Weſt* only ſound, what praiſes belonged to the *Catholick Church* in general, did of right devolve to that part which remained *ſound* in the opinion of thoſe perſons who judged ſo. You would needs therefore from hence have your Church accounted *Catholick* now, by the ſame argument that *Tully* ſaid (of the *Roman Lady*, who ſtill affirmed, ſhe was but *thirty years* of age) that he believed it, for he had heard her ſay ſo *twenty Years* before; ſo muſt we believe your *Church ſound* and *Catholick*, becauſe it was ſaid ſo of her ſo many *hundred years* ſince; as though no *Infirmities* or *Wrinkles* could have come upon her ever ſince. Prove your *Church* to be as *ſound* and *orthodox*, as *pure* and *holy* now, as ſhe was in the primitive *Fathers* time, and we will not grudge her the higheſt of thoſe *commendations* which were given her by them. But, without doing this, your Teſtimonies come to nothing. The ſame Anſwer will ſerve the remaining Teſtimonies of *Eulalius*, and the *Emperor Gratian*, who only ſpake of the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, as it was then: That of *Fulgentius* ſtiling the *Roman Church*, The *top of the World*, only imports the *eminency* of it, in regard of the power of that City it was in, and ſo is wide enough from your purpoſe. Thus we have conſidered all that you have produced out of *Antiquity*, to prove that the *Church* is called *Catholick*, with a particular relation to, and dependence on the *Church* of *Rome*, and can find nothing at all belonging to her, as the *center of Catholiciſm*, but that thoſe things which are ſaid of her, and Communion with her, *in relation to being called Catholick*, might as well have agreed with any other *Apoſtolical Church* remaining found in the *Catholick Faith*.

Vid. Fortunat. & Acacium.

Profligato à ſobole mala patrimonio, apud vos ſolos incorrupta Patrum ſervatur hæreditas. —— Nunc in Occidente Sol Juſtitiæ oritur, in Oriente autem Lucifer ille, qui ceciderat, ſuper ſydera poſuit thronum ſuum, &c. Ibid.

P. 132. n. 6. Hence it appears, that what his Lordſhip is pleaſed to term, a *perfect Jeſuitiſm*, *viz. the meaſuring the Catholick Church*, *by that of* Rome, is really nothing elſe, and that *the perfect miſtake* belongs to you, who aſſert, that *it was a received and known Truth in the ancient Church*. Your vindication of the propriety of your *Churches* being called *the Roman Catholick Church*, from the *Roman Empire*, and the *Jewiſh Church*, would then ſignifie ſomething, when you have proved that the *Pope* hath as much the *Government* of the *Church*, as the *Roman Emperour* had of all the *Provinces* within the confines

confines of the *Empire*, or that we are all bound as much to resort to *Rome*, as the *Jews* were to *Jerusalem* for the solemn worship of God. In the mean time the absurdity is never the less for being vulgar, in calling yours, The *Roman Catholick Church*. And yet, as tho' you had been only demonstrating these things, you tell us very magisterially, *The truth is, in all doubts concerning matter of Doctrine, recourse is to be had to S.* Peter's *successor, who (at least with a General Council) can infallibly resolve all difficulties.* An excellent way of proving, to say, *The truth is*, Might not I as well say, *The truth is*, the *Pope* neither in *Council*, nor out of it hath any Infallibility at all? And would not this be full as good an *Answer* as yours is an *Argument?* But *the very truth is*, you had rather have these things believed, than go about to prove them; lest the weakness of the arguments should lay too much open your fond pretence of *Infallibility*. Before you prove, *That the Pope can carry his Infallibility out of* Rome *with him*, shew us that he hath it there. I grant S. *Peter had been infallible, tho' he had never been at* Rome; and it is far from being clear, that the *Pope* is at all the more *infallible* for *his being there*. How far you have been from proving, *That the Faith of every particular Church is to be examined and proved to be Catholick by its conformity to the Faith of the* Roman *Church*, may abundantly appear from the preceding discourse. *Those Questions*, which you say, *make nothing to your purpose concerning the Popes transferring his chair at* Rome, *and the* Roman *Clergies deserting him and the true Faith:* I shall so far believe you in, as to ease my self of the trouble of considering them any further than hath been done already in the very entrance into this Conference.

§. 16. And here, you tell us, *You now come to perform your Promise, viz. to examine more fully his Lordships pretended solutions* (as you call them) *of* Bellarmine's *authorities in behalf of the Infallibility of the Church of* Rome. But for all your boasting at first, what great things you would do, you seem a little fearful of engaging too far, and therefore are resolved only to maintain them in general, as they make for the *Infallible Authority* of the *Church*, or of the *Pope defining Articles of Faith in a General Council.* But, as far as you dare go, I shall attend your motions, and doubt not to make it evident, that none of these *authorities* have any reference to that sense, which you only offer to maintain them in, and that though they had, yet no such thing as *Infallibility* can be proved out of them.

P. 133. The first authority is out of S. *Cyprian*'s Letter to *Cornelius Bishop* of *Rome*, whose words I am contented should be recited as fully as may be; In which he chargeth *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus with their Complices, that having set up a Bishop against him at* Carthage, *they sail to the chair of* Peter, *and the principal Church from whence the sacerdotal Unity had its rise, and carry Letters from prophane and Schismatical persons, not considering that the* Romans (*whose Faith was committed by the Apostle*) *were such to whom perfidiousness could not have access.* Now the meaning of this place you would have to be this, and no other, *viz. that the See of S.* Peter, *which is the principal of all Churches, was so infallibly directed by the Holy Ghost, that no errour in Faith could have access to it, or be admitted by it, if not as a particular Church, yet at least as the head of the Universal Church of Christ, and as the Fountain of Priestly Unity; which S.* Cyprian *here expresly affirms that Church and See to be.* Thus you sum up at last, as the most which can be made of this Testimony; and which is indeed far more in all particulars than it can amount to, which will appear by particular examinations of what you return in

Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram, atq; ad Ecclesiam Principalem; unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, à Schismaticis & prophanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos (quorum fides Apostolo prædicante laudata est) ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Cyprian. ep. 55. ad Cornel. n. 16.

P. 134.

answer to his Lordship. Three thinks his Lordship answers to this place.
Sect. 3. n. 3, &c. 1. *That* perfidia *can hardly stand here for errour in Faith*; and if so, then this can make nothing for *Infallibility*. 2. *That supposing it granted to signifie errour in Faith and Doctrine, yet it belongs not to the* Romans *absolutely, but with a respect to those first* Romans *whose Faith was commended by the Apostle.* 3. *That it seems to be rather a Rhetorical insinuation, than a dogmatical assertion.* And that S. *Cyprian* could not be supposed to assert herein the *Popes Infallibility*, appears by the *contracts* between him and the *Bishops* of *Rome*. This is the short of his Lordships answer to this place, to which we must consider what you reply. 1. His Lordship says, *That perfidia can hardly stand for errour in Faith or misbelief, but it properly signifies malicious falshood in matter of trust and action, not errour in Faith, but in fact against the discipline and Government of the Church.* And to make this interpretation appear the more probable, his Lordship gives an account of the story which was the occasion of writing that *Epistle*, which is this, as his Lordship reports it from *Binius* and *Baronius*; *In the year* 255. *there was a Council in* Carthage *in the cause of two Schismaticks*, Felicissimus *and* Novatian, *about restoring of them to the communion of the Church, which had lapsed in time of danger from Christianity to Idolatry.* Felicissimus *would admit all even without penance, and* Novatian *would admit none, no not after penance. The Fathers* 42 *in number went, as Truth led them, between both extreams. To this Council came* Privatus *a known Heretick, but was not admitted because he was formerly excommunicated, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his Complices together, and chooses one* Fortunatus *(who was formerly condemned as well as himself) Bishop of* Carthage, *and set him up against S.* Cyprian. *This done* Felicissimus *and his Fellows haste to* Rome *with letters testimonial from their own party, and pretend that* 25 *Bishops concurred with them: and their desire was to be received into the communion of the Roman Church, and to have their new Bishop acknowledged.* Cornelius *then* Pope, *though their haste had now prevented S.* Cyprian's *letters, having formerly heard from him, both of them, and their Schism in* Africk, *would neither hear them, nor receive their letters. They grew insolent and furious (the ordinary way that Schismaticks take.) Upon this* Cornelius *writes to S.* Cyprian, *and S.* Cyprian *in this Epistle gives* Cornelius *thanks for refusing these* African *fugitives, declares their Schism and wickedness at large, and encourages him and all Bishops to maintain the Ecclesiastical Discipline and censures against any the boldest threatnings of wicked Schismaticks.* This being the story, his Lordship says, *He would fain know why* perfidia *(all circumstances considered) may not stand here in its proper sense for cunning and perfidious dealing, which these* Men *having practised at* Carthage, *thought now to obtrude upon the Bishop of* Rome *also, but that he was wary enough not to be over-reached by busie Schismaticks?* This demand of his Lordship seeming very just and reasonable we are bound to consider what reasons you give,
P. 113. why *perfidia* must be understood *for errour in Faith* and not in the sense here mentioned. *Why calls he* (say you) *S.* Peter's *chair*, Ecclesiam principalem *(the chief Church) but because it is the head to which all other Churches must be subordinate in matter of doctrine? the words following signifie as much,* Unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, *from which chair of S.* Peter *as it were from its fountain, unity in* Priesthood *and consequently unity in Faith derived. Why brings he the Apostle as* Panegyrist *of the Roman Faith? Is it forsooth, because no malicious falshood in matter of trust or errour in fact against the Discipline and Government of the Church can have access unto them, as the Bishop will needs misinterpret the place? or rather because no errour in Faith can approach the See Apostolick? Certain it is,* perfidia *in this sense, is diametri-*

cally

cally oppoſed to the Faith of the Romans immediately before commended by the Apoſtle (which was true Chriſtian Faith) and conſequently it muſt of neceſſity be taken for the quite contrary, viz. *misbelief or error in Faith.* Three Arguments in theſe words you produce, why *perfidia* muſt be underſtood of *error in Faith.* 1. *Becauſe the Church of* Rome *is called the chief Church*; but is it not poſſible it ſhould be called ſo in any other ſenſe, but as the *head of all other Churches in matter of doctrine?* Is it not ſufficiently clear from *Antiquity*, that there were other accounts of calling the *Church of Rome* the *chief* or *principal Church*, as the *eminency* of it joyned with the *power* of the *City* (the *potentior principalitas* in *Irenæus*) which advanced its reputation to the height it was then at? What *matters of doctrine* do you find brought to the *Church* of *Rome* to be *Infallibly* decided there in S. *Cyprian*'s time? how little did S. *Cyprian* believe this, when he ſo vehemently oppoſed the judgment of *Stephen Biſhop of Rome* in the caſe of *rebaptization?* Doth he write, ſpeak, or carry himſelf in that *Controverſie* like one that owned the *Church of Rome* to be *head* of all *other Churches*, to which they muſt be ſubordinate in *matter of doctrine?* Nay in the very next words S. *Cyprian* argues againſt *appeals* to *Rome*, and is it poſſible then to think, that in theſe words he ſhould give ſuch an *abſolute power* and *authority* to it? And therefore any one who would reconcile S. *Cyprian* to *himſelf* muſt by thoſe words of *Eccleſia principalis* only underſtand the *dignity* and *eminency*, and not the *power*, much leſs the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome*. And no more is implyed in the Second, *That it is ſaid to be the fountain of Sacerdotal Unity*, which ſome think may probably refer to the *Prieſthood* of the *Church of Africk*, which had its riſe from the *Church* of *Rome*, as appears by *Tertullian* and others, in which ſenſe he might very well ſay, that *the Unity of the Prieſthood did ſpring from thence*; or if it be taken in a more large and comprehenſive ſenſe, it can import no more than that the *Church* of *Rome* was owned as the *Principium Unitatis*, which certainly is a very different thing from an *infallible judgment* in matters of Faith. For what connexion is there between *Unity* in *Government*, and *Infallibility* in *Faith?* Suppoſe the *Church* of *Rome* ſhould be owned as the *principal Member* of the *Catholick Church*, and therefore that the *Unity* of the *Church* ſhould begin there in regard of the *dignity* of it, doth it thence follow that there muſt be an *abſolute ſubordination* of all other *Churches* to it? Nothing then can be inferr'd from either of thoſe particulars, that by *perfidia*, error in Faith muſt be underſtood, taking thoſe two expreſſions in the moſt favourable ſenſe that can be put upon them. But conſidering the preſent ſtate of the *Church* of *Rome* at the time when *Feliciſſimus* and *Fortunatus* came thither, I am apt to think another interpretation more probable than either of the foregoing. For which we muſt remember that there was a *Schiſm* at *Rome* between *Novatianus* and *Cornelius*, the former challenging to be *Biſhop* there, as well as the latter, upon which a great breach was made among them. Now theſe perſons going out of *Africa* to *Rome*, that they might manage their buſineſs with the more advantage, addreſs themſelves to *Cornelius* and his *party*; upon which S. *Cyprian* ſaith, *Navigare audent ad Petri Cathedram atque ad Eccleſiam principalem, unde Unitas ſacerdotalis exorta eſt*, thereby expreſſing their *confidence* that they not only went to *Rome*, but when they were there, they did not preſently ſide with the *Schiſmatical party* of the *Novatians* there, but as tho' they had been *true Catholicks*, they go to *Cornelius*, who being the legal ſucceſſor of S. *Peter* in oppoſition to *Novatianus*, calls his *See the chair of S.* Peter, and the *principal Church*, and the *ſpring of the Unity of the Prieſthood*; becauſe the contra-

Tertul. de præſcript. c. 36. Greg. l. 7. Ind. 1. ep. 32.

ry party of *Novatianus* had been the cauſe of all the *Schiſm* and *diſunion* which had been among them. And in this ſenſe which ſeems very agreeable to S. *Cyprian's* words and deſign, we may eaſily underſtand what this *perfidia* was, *viz.* that *falſeneſs* and *perfidious dealing* of theſe perſons, that although they were *Schiſmaticks* themſelves, yet they were ſo far from ſeeming ſo at their coming to *Rome*, that as though they had been very good *Catholicks*, they ſeek to joyn in communion with *Cornelius* and the *Catholick party* with him. By which we ſee what little probability there is from thoſe *expreſſions* that *perfidia* muſt be taken, *for an errour in Faith.* But, 3. You ſay, *To what purpoſe elſe doth he mention S.* Paul's *commendation of their Faith, if this* perfidia *were not immediately oppoſite to it?* But then inform us what part of that *Apoſtolical Faith* was it, which *Felicisſimus and Fortunatus* ſought to violate at *Rome?* It is apparent their whole deſign was to be admitted into *communion* with the *Church* of *Rome* (which in all probability is that *acceſs* here ſpoken of): if therefore this *perfidia* imported ſome *errour in Faith*, it muſt be ſome *errour* broached by thoſe particular perſons as contrary to the old *Roman Faith* which was extoll'd by the *Apoſtle*. And although theſe perſons might be guilty of *errours*, yet the ground of their going to *Rome*, was not upon any *matter of Doctrine*, whereby they ſought to corrupt the *Church* of *Rome*, but in order to the juſtifying of their *Schiſm*, by being admitted into the *communion* of that *Church*. Notwithſtanding then any thing you have produced to the contrary, there is no neceſſity of underſtanding *perfidia*, for an *errour in matter of Faith.* And S. *Cyprian's* mentioning the praiſe given to the *Romans* for their *Faith* by the *Apoſtle*, was not to ſhew the oppoſition between that and the *perfidia* as an *errour in Faith*, but that being the greateſt *Elogium* of the *Church* of *Rome* extant in *Scripture*, he thought it now moſt convenient to uſe it, the better to engage *Cornelius* to oppoſe the proceedings of the *Schiſmaticks* there. Although withal, I ſuppoſe, S. *Cyprian* might give him ſome taſt of his old office, of *Rhetorician* in the alluſion between *fides* and *perfidia*, without ever intending that *perfidia* ſhould be taken in any other ſenſe than what was proper to the cauſe in hand.

You having effected ſo little in the ſolution of his Lordſhips firſt anſwer, you have little cauſe to boaſt in your following words, *That hence his other*
Ibid. *explication alſo vaniſhes into ſmoak*, viz. *when he aſſerts that* Perfidia non poteſt *may be taken hyperbolically for* non facile poteſt; *becauſe this interpretation ſuits not with thoſe high Elogiums given by S.* Cyprian *to the Roman Church, as being the principal Church, the Church whence Unity of Faith and Diſcipline is derived to all other Chriſtian Churches.* If you indeed may have the liberty to interpret S. *Cyprians* words as you pleaſe, by adding ſuch things to them, of which there is no intimation in what he ſaith, you may make what you pleaſe unſuitable to them. For although he calls it *the principal Church, from whence the Unity of the Prieſthood is ſprung*; yet what is this to *the Unity of Faith and Diſcipline as derived from thence to all other Churches*, as you would perſwade the unwary reader that theſe were S. *Cyprians* words, which are only your groundleſs interpretation of them. And therefore there is no ſuch improbability in what his Lordſhip ſays, *That this may be only a Rhetorical exceſs of ſpeech, in which S.* Cyprian *may* laudando præcipere, *by commending them to be ſuch, inſtruct them that ſuch indeed they ought to be, to whom perfidiouſneſs ſhould not get acceſs.* And for this he inſtanceth in ſuch another *Rhetorical expreſſion* of *Syneſius* to *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, wherein he tells him that he ought to eſteem *what his Throne ſhould determine as an Oracle or Divine Law.* And certainly this comes nearer

nearer Infallibility than that of St. *Cyprian* doth. But what inconveniency there ſhould be, that St. *Cyprian* by this interpretation ſhould give no more prerogative to the *Church of Rome*, than to that of *Alexandria* or *Antioch*, I cannot eaſily imagine till you prove ſome greater *Infallibility* attributed then to the *Church* of *Rome*, than was to other *Apoſtolical Churches*: Which as yet we are to ſeek for.

But at length (you tell us) *after much ado he grants* perfidia *may be taken for errour in Faith, or for perfidious Misbelievers and Schiſmaticks, who had betrayed their Faith*; *but then* (ſay you) *he cavils with the word* Romanos. *This muſt be limited only to thoſe Chriſtians, who then lived in* Rome, *to whom* quà tales, *as long as they continued ſuch, errour in Faith could not have acceſs.* What you ſay, his Lordſhip doth *at length, and after much ado*, he did freely and willingly; but that you might have occaſion for thoſe words, you altered the courſe of his *anſwers*, and put the *ſecond* in the laſt place. But ſtill you have the unhappineſs to miſunderſtand him. For although he grants that *perfidia* may relate to *errour in Faith*, yet as it is here uſed, it is not underſtood of it *abſtractly* but *concretely*, for *perfidious misbelievers*, *i. e.* ſuch *perfidious Perſons*, excommunicated out of other *Churches*, were not likely to get acceſs at *Rome*, or to find admittance into their Communion. And in this ſenſe, it is plain that St. *Cyprian* did not intend by theſe words, to exempt the *Romans* from *poſſibility of error*, but to brand his Adverſaries with a title due to their merit, calling them *perfidious*, *i. e.* ſuch as had betrayed or perverted the *Faith*. When you therefore ask, *is not this great praiſe?* I ſuppoſe none but your ſelf would make a queſtion of it, *viz.* that the *Church* of *Rome* had then ſo great *purity* as not to admit ſuch *perfidious Misbelievers* into her Communion. And it were well if the preſent *Church* of *Rome* were capable of the ſame *praiſe*. But when you add, *It is as if St.* Cyprian *ſhould ſay St.* Peter's *See could not err ſo long as it continued conſtant in the Truth*; you wilfully miſunderſtand his Lordſhip's meaning, who ſpeaks of the *Perſons* and not meerly of their *errors*; but however, is it not a commendation to ſay that the *Church* of *Rome* conſiſted of ſuch *Perſons* then who adhered to the *Apoſtolical Faith*, and therefore *error* could not have *acceſs* to them? And I look on it as ſo great a commendation, that I heartily wiſh it could be verified of your *Church* now. Neither is this any ſuch *Identical Propoſition* as that you produce, but only a declaration of their preſent conſtancy, and inferring thence, how unlikely it was that *errours* ſhould be admitted by them. His Lordſhip to make it plain that St. *Cyprian* had no meaning to aſſert the unerring *Infallibility* of either *Pope* or *Church* of *Rome*, inſiſts on the conteſt which after happened between St. *Cyprian* and *Pope Stephen*; upon which he ſaith expreſly, *That Pope* Stephen *did not only maintain an error but the very cauſe of Hereticks, and that againſt Chriſtians and the very Church of God.* And after this he chargeth him, *with obſtinacy and preſumption*; *And I hope this is plain enough* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *to ſhew that St.* Cyprian *had no great opinion of the Roman Infallibility.*

Ibid.

Stephanus frater noſter Hæreticorum cauſam contra Chriſtianos & contra Dei Eccleſiam aſſerere conatur. Cypr. ad Pompeium per Eraſm. Baſil. p. 327.

To this you anſwer, *With a famous diſtinction of the Popes erring as a private Doctor, and as the Univerſal Paſtor, and that St.* Cyprian *might very well be ſuppoſed to think the Pope erred only in the firſt ſenſe.* Not to ſpend time in *rifling* this diſtinction of the *Popes erring Perſonally*, but not *judicially*, or as a *private Doctor*, but not as *Univerſal Paſtor*, which it were an eaſie matter to do, by manifeſting the incongruity of it, and the abſurdities conſequent upon it, in caſe that *Doctrine* which the *Pope errs* in, comes

P. 134.

comes to be *judicially* decided by him; It is sufficient for us at present to shew that this distinction cannot relieve you in our present case. For your *Doctors* tell us, the *Pope* then errs *personally* and as a *private Doctor*, when he errs only in his *own judgment* without *obliging* others to *believe*, what he judges to be *true*; but then he errs *judicially* and as *Universal Pastor*, when he *declares* his *judgment* so as to *oblige* others to *receive* it as *true*. Now can any thing be more evident than that St. *Cyprian* judged *Pope Stephen* to err in this *latter*, and not in the former sense? For doth he not absolutely and severely declare himself against St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion: Condemning it as an *error* and an *innovation?* But say you, *He did not properly define any Doctrine in that Contestation*; *but said* nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum. But was not that the question what was *traditum* and what not, for *Cyprian* and his *Party* denyed it to be a *Tradition*, which *Stephen* asserted was so; and doth he not therefore undertake to define something in this cause? But say you, *If this argument hold good against the Infallibility of Popes*, viz. *that St.* Cyprian *held Pope* Stephen *erred, therefore the Pope may err in matters of Faith*; *it will be a good consequence also to say, St.* Cyprian *held Pope* Stephen *erred, even whilst he maintained an universal immemorial Tradition——therefore the Pope may err whilst he follows such a Tradition.* I answer, 1. Who besides you, would not have seen, that the question was not, Whether the *Pope* was *Infallible* or no, but whether St. *Cyprian judged him to be Infallible* or no? For if it appear that St. *Cyprian* did not judge him *Infallible*, then those former words cannot be interpreted to such a sense as doth imply Infallibility. 2. No doubt if the *Pope* may err in other things, he may *err* when he thinks he follows an *universal immemorial Tradition*; not that he doth err, when he doth really follow such a one, but he may err in *judging* that to be an *universal immemorial Tradition* which is not: And this was the case between St. *Cyprian* and *Pope Stephen*; the *Pope* pretended to follow an *universal Tradition*; St. *Cyprian* judgeth him to err in it, and that it was not so. And is it not plain still, notwithstanding these frivolous pretences, that St. *Cyprian* had no opinion at all of the *Pope's Infallibility* in any sense? And therefore out of honour to him, you are bound to interpret his former words to some other sense than that of any *Infallibility* in the *Church* of *Rome*. Thus all his Lordship's Answers standing good, you have gained no great matter by this first Testimony of St. *Cyprian*.

The second Authority is out of S. *Hierom*, whose words are, *The Roman Faith commended by the Apostle, admits not such* præstigiæ, *deceits and delusions into it, though an Angel should Preach it otherwise than it was Preached at first, being armed and fenced by St.* Paul's *Authority it cannot be changed.* Here you tell us, *You willingly agree with his Lordship that by* Romanam fidem, *St.* Hierom *understands the Catholick Faith of Christ*, and so you concur with him against *Bellarmine*, *that it cannot be understood of the particular Church of* Rome. But by the way you charge your Adversaries, *with great inconsequence, that in this place they make Roman and Catholick to be the same, and yet usually condemn you for joyning as* Synonyma's *Roman and Catholick together.* A wonderful want of judgment! as though the *Roman Faith* might not be the *Catholick Faith* then, and yet the *Catholick Faith* not be the *Roman Faith* now. The former speech only affirms that the *Faith* at *Rome* was *truly Catholick*; the latter implies that no *Faith* can be *Catholick* but what agrees with *Rome*: And think you there is no difference

Attamen licito Romanam fidem Apostolicâ voce laudatam ejusmodi præstigias non recipere, etiamsi Angelus aliter annunciet, quàm semel prædicatum est, Pauli authoritate munitam non posse mutari. Hieron. l. 3. Apol. c. Ruff. cap. 4.

rence between these two? But you say further, *That this Catholick Faith must not here be taken abstractly that so it cannot be changed, for* Ruffinus *was not ignorant of that, but that it must be understood of the immutable Faith of the See Apostolick, so highly commended by the Apostle and St.* Hierom; *which is founded upon such a rock, that even an Angel himself is not able to shake it.* But St. *Hierom* speaking this with a reference to that *Faith* he supposeth the *Apostle* commended in them (although the *Apostle* doth not so much commend the *Catholickness* or soundness of their *Faith* as the *act of believing* in them, and therefore whatever is drawn from thence, whether by St. *Hierom* or any else can have no force in it; for if he should infer the immutability of the Faith of the *Church* of *Rome* from so apparently weak a foundation, there can be no greater strength in his testimony than there is in the ground on which it is built; and if there be any force in this Argument, the *Church* of *Thessalonica* will be as *Infallible* as *Rome*, for her Faith is commended rather in a more ample manner by the *Apostle* than that of *Rome* is) St. *Hierom*, I say, referring to that *Faith* he supposes the *Apostle* commended in them, must only be understood of the *unchangeableness of that first Faith*, which appears by the mention of *an Angel from Heaven Preaching otherwise.* Which certainly cannot with any tolerable sense be meant thus, that St. *Hierom* supposed it beyond the power of an *Angel from Heaven to alter the Faith of the Roman Church.* For in the very same *Apology* he expresseth his great fears, lest the Faith of the *Romans* should be corrupted by the *Books* of *Ruffinus.* But, say you, *What is this then to* Ruffinus, *who knew as well as St.* Hierom, *that Faith could not change its essence?* However, though St. *Hierom* should here speak of the *Primitive* and *Apostolical Faith* which was then received at *Rome*, that it could receive no alteration; yet this was very pertinent to be told *Ruffinus*, because St. *Hierom* charges him with an endeavour to subvert the *Faith* not meerly at *Rome*, but in all other places, by publishing the *Books* of *Origen* with an *Encomiastick Preface* to them; and therefore the telling him, *The Catholick Faith* would admit of no *alteration*, which was received at *Rome* as elsewhere, might be an Argument to discourage him from any *attempts* of that nature. And the main charge against *Ruffinus*, is not an endeavour to subvert merely the *People of Rome*, but the *Latin Church* by his translation; and therefore these words ought to be taken in their greatest latitude; and so imply not at all any *Infallibility* in the *Roman See.*

P. 135. 1 Thess. 1. 8.

Non tibi sufficit scandalum Graciæ, nisi illud & Latinorum auribus ingeras. Id. ib.

The remaining *Testimonies* of *Gregory Nazianzene*, *Cyril*, and *Ruffinus*, (as appears to any one who reads them) only import that the *Roman Church* had to their time preserved the *Catholick Faith*; but they do not assert it impossible it should ever do otherwise; or that she is an *Infallible preserver* of it, and none of their *Testimonies* are so proper to the *Church* of *Rome*, but they would equally hold for any other *Apostolical Churches* at that time. *Gregory Nazianzene* indeed says, *That it would become the Church of* Rome *to hold the entire Faith always:* And would it not *become any other Church* to do so too? Doth this import that she shall *Infallibly* do it, or rather that it is her *duty* to do it? And if these then be *such pregnant Authorities* with you, it is a sign there is little or nothing to be found in *Antiquity* for your purpose.

P. 136. 137.

But before we end this Chapter, we are called to a new task on occasion of a Testimony of St. *Cyril* produced by his Lordship instead of that in *Bellarmine* which appeared not in that Chapter, where his *Name* is mentioned.

§. 18.

tioned. In which he asserts, *That the foundation and firmness which the Church of Christ hath, is placed not in or upon the Person, much less the Successor of St.* Peter; *but upon the Faith which by God's Spirit in him he so firmly professed: which* (saith his Lordship) *is the common received opinion both of the ancient Fathers and of the Protestants. Upon this Rock, that is, upon this Faith will I build my Church.* On which occasion you run presently out into that large common place concerning *Tu es Petrus*, and *super hanc Petram*; and although I should grant all that you so earnestly contend for, *viz. That these words are not spoken of St.* Peter's *Confession, but of his Person*, I know no advantage which will accrue to your cause by it. For although very many of the *Fathers* understand this place of St. *Peter's Confession*, as containing in it the Ground and *Foundation* of the *Christian Religion*, *Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God*, which therefore may well be said to be *the Rock* on which *Christ* would build his *Church*, and although it were no matter of difficulty to defend this interpretation from all exceptions; yet because I think it not improbable (the words running by way of address to St. *Peter*) that something *peculiar* to him, is contained in them, I shall not contend with you about that. But then, if you say that the meaning of St. *Peter's* being the *Rock*, is, *The constant Infallibility in Faith which was derived from St.* Peter *to the Church of* Rome, as you seem to suggest, you must remember you have a new task to make good, and it is not saying, That St. *Peter* was meant by the *Rock*, will come within some *leagues* of doing it. I pass therefore by that discourse as a thing we are not much concerned in, for it is brought in by his *Lordship* as the last thing out of that testimony of *Cyril:* But you were contented to let go the other more material Observations, that you might more freely expatiate *super hanc Petram.* Touching *Ruffinus*, I grant his Lordship is of opinion, *That he neither did nor could account the Roman Church Infallible*, for which he gives this reason, *For if he had so esteemed of it, he would not have dissented from it in so main a point as is the Canon of Scripture, as he plainly doth: For reckoning up the Canonical Books, he most manifestly dissents from the* Roman *Church. Therefore either* Ruffinus *did not think the Church of* Rome *was Infallible, or else the Church of* Rome *at this day reckons up more Books within the Canon, than heretofore she did. If she do, then she is changed in a main point of Faith, the Canon of Scripture, and is absolutely convinced not to be Infallible; for if she were right in her reckoning then, she is wrong now; and if she be right now, she was wrong then; and if she do not reckon now more than she did, when* Ruffinus *lived, then he reckons fewer than she, and so dissents from her, which doubtless he durst not have done, had he thought her judgment Infallible. Yea and he sets this mark upon his dissent besides, that he reckons up the Books of the Canon just so, and no otherwise, than as he received them out of the Monuments of the Fore-Fathers, and out of which the assertions of our Faith are to be taken.* Now what have you to say to this strong and nervous Discourse of his Lordship? *Why* (forsooth) *this argument of the Bishop is far from being convincing.* And why so? *For* (say you) *though it should be granted that the Catholick Church* (the Roman you mean) *at present declares more Books to be contained in the Canon, than she did in* Ruffinus *his time, yet this could be no error in her.* That is strange that the *Church* should *declare* the *Canon* to be compleat then, without these *Books*, and now not to be, and yet neither time be in an *error! No* (say you) *unless it be shewed* (*which I am sure cannot be*) *that*

Petram opinor per agnominationem nihil aliud, quàm inconcussam & firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit; in quâ Ecclesia Christi ita fundata & firmata esset, ut non laberetur, & esset inexpugnabilis inferorum portis, in perpetuum manens. S. Cyril. Alex. Dial. de Trinit. l. 4. p. 278. Paris. A. 1604.

P. 138. 139.

P. 16.

Ruffin. in Symbol. p. 188, 189. p. 139.

she

ſhe condemned thoſe books then as not Divine Scripture, or not Canonical, which now ſhe declares to be Divine or Canonical. Excellent good ſtill! that which you are ſure *cannot be ſhewed*, is obvious to any one that hath *eyes* in his head. For I only ask you, Whether the *Church* of *Rome* did declare any *Canon* or no, in that age? If *not*, according to your principles thoſe who lived in that *age* could have no *Divine Faith* as to the *Scripture:* if ſhe did declare the *Canon* of *Scripture*, without theſe *Books*, did ſhe not thereby condemn theſe *Books* to be not *Canonical?* For you ſay, that all are bound to take her judgment what is in the *Canon* and what not; if therefore ſhe did not put them into the *Canon*, did ſhe not leave them out of the *Canon?* or, Can you find any *medium* between *being put in* and *being left out? Yes* (ſay you) *theſe Books were left then under diſpute:* with whom were they under diſpute? with the *Church* of *Rome* or not? If *with her*, was ſhe not *Infallible* the mean while, when ſo great a matter as the *Canon* of *Scripture* was *under diſpute* with her? But this whole buſineſs concerning the *Canon* of *Scripture* is largely diſcuſſed already; only here it is ſufficient to ſhew, how you are pent in on every ſide, ſo that there is no poſſibility of getting out.

As to the ſtrait (his Lordſhip takes notice of) *that the Church of* Rome *is driven to, in borrowing a teſtimony for her Infallibility from one whom ſhe branded with Hereſie in that very Book from whence this teſtimony is taken*; You anſwer, *That it evidently argues the truth and uncorruptedneſs of that Church, which is ſo clear that even her Adverſaries cannot but confeſs it.* But if they confeſs it no better than *Ruffinus* doth, ſhe will have little cauſe to applaud her ſelf for her *Integrity* in that reſpect. And although a Teſtimony may be taken from perſons ſuſpected in ſome things, yet it argues thoſe have but very *few friends*, who are fain to make uſe of their *enemies* to bear witneſs for them. What follows concerning a *particular Church being Infallible*, becauſe you diſown it (although not conſonantly to the principles of your party as was ſhewed in the occaſion of the Conference) I paſs by. P. 140.

The errors of the *Church of Rome* (which his Lordſhip mentions, but you ſay *proves not*) you ſhall find abundantly proved before our task is over.

Your vindication of *Bellarmine* from inconſiſtency in ſaying *A propoſition is moſt true, and yet but peradventure as true as another*, is ſo fine and ſubtil that it were an injury to the Reader to deprive him of the pleaſure of peruſing it. And yet when all is done, *a Propoſition very falſe* might be *as true* as this which *Bellarmine* ſpeaks of, *viz. That the Pope when he teacheth the whole Church in matters of Faith cannot err.*

And thus I have cleared that there can be no ground of an imputation of *Schiſm* on our *Church* from hence, that the *Roman Church is the Catholick Church*, which acceptation of the *Catholick Church* I have manifeſted to be as great a ſtranger to *Antiquity* as it is an enemy to *Reaſon:* And that the calling the *Roman Church* the *Catholick Church*, is, (as his Lordſhip truly ſaith) *a meer Novelty* and *perfect Jeſuitiſm.*

CHAP. II.

Proteſtants no Schiſmaticks.

Schiſm a culpable ſeparation; therefore the Queſtion of Schiſm, muſt be determined by enquiring into the cauſes of it. The plea from the Church of Rome's *being once a right Church, conſidered. No neceſſity of aſſigning the punctual time when errors crept into her. An account why the originals of errors ſeem obſcure. By* Stapleton's *confeſſion, the* Roman *and Catholick Church were not the ſame. The falſity of that aſſertion manifeſted, That there could be no pure Church ſince the Apoſtles times, if the* Roman *Church were corrupt. No one particular Church free from corruptions; yet no ſeparation from the Catholick Church. How far the Catholick Church may be ſaid to err. Men may have diſtinct communion from any one particular Church, yet not ſeparate from the Catholick Church. The Teſtimony of* Petrus de Alliaco *vindicated.* Bellarmine *not miſ-cited.* Almain *full to his Lordſhips purpoſe. The* Romaniſts *guilty of the preſent Schiſm, and not Proteſtants. In what ſenſe there can be no juſt cauſe of Schiſm; and how far that concerns our caſe. Proteſtants did not depart from the Church of* Rome, *but were thruſt out of it. The Vindication of the Church of* Rome *from Schiſm, at laſt depends upon the two falſe Principles, Of her Infallibility, and being the Catholick Church. The Teſtimonies of S.* Bernard *and S.* Auſtin *not to the purpoſe. The Catalogue of Fundamentals, the Churches not erring,* &c. *referr'd back to their proper places.*

§. 1. BEfore I come to examine the particulars of this Chapter, it will be neceſſary to ſee, what the ſtate of the Controverſie was, concerning Schiſm, between his Lordſhip and his Adverſary. His Lordſhip delivers his ſenſe clearly and fully in theſe words; *'Tis too true indeed, that there is*
P. 133. ſect. 21. n. 1. *a miſerable rent in the Church, and I make no queſtion but the beſt Men do moſt bemoan it; nor is he a Chriſtian that would not have Unity, might he have it with Truth. But, I never ſaid, nor thought, that the Proteſtants made this rent. The cauſe of the Schiſm is yours; for you thruſt us from you, becauſe we call'd for truth, and redreſs of abuſes. For a Schiſm muſt needs be theirs, whoſe the cauſe of it is. The woe runs full out of the mouth of Chriſt ever againſt him that gives the offence; not againſt him that takes it ever.* And in the Margent, ſhewing *that a ſeparation may ſometimes be neceſſary,* he inſtanceth in *the orthodox departing from the communion of the* Arrians: upon which he ſays; *It cannot be that a Man ſhould do well in making a Schiſm. There may be therefore a neceſſary ſeparation, which yet incurs not the guilt of*
P. 135. n. 3. *Schiſm; and that is, when Doctrines are taught contrary to the Catholick Faith.* And after ſaith, *The Proteſtants did not depart: for, departure is voluntary, ſo was not theirs; I ſay not theirs, taking their whole body and cauſe together. For, that ſome among them were peeviſh, and ſome ignorantly zealous, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confeſſing it. Your body is not ſo perfect (I wot well) but that many amongſt you are as pettiſh and as*
P. 136. n. 4. *ignorantly zealous as any of ours. You muſt not ſuffer for theſe, nor we for thoſe, nor ſhould the Church of Chriſt for either.* And when *A. C.* ſaith, *That though the Church of* Rome *did thruſt the Proteſtants from her by excommunication, yet they had firſt divided themſelves by obſtinate holding and teaching Opinions contrary to the* Roman *Faith.* His Lordſhip anſwers, *So then in his Opinion, Excommunication on their part was not the prime cauſe of this*

diviſion, but the holding and teaching of contrary Opinions. Why but then in my opinion (ſaith he) *that holding and teaching was not the prime cauſe neither, but the corruptions and ſuperſtitions of* Rome, *which forced many Men to hold and teach the contrary: So, the prime cauſe was theirs ſtill.* And *A. C.* telling him, *That he ſaid that it was ill done of thoſe who firſt made the ſeparation.* He anſwers, *That though he remembred not that he ſaid thoſe words; yet withal adds, If I did not ſay it then, I do ſay it now; and moſt true it is, That it was ill done of thoſe, who're they were, who firſt made the ſeparation. But then* A. C. *muſt not underſtand me of Actual only, but of Cauſal ſeparation. For (as I ſaid before) the Schiſm is theirs, whoſe the cauſe of it is: and he makes the ſeparation that gives the firſt juſt cauſe of it; not he that makes an actual ſeparation upon a juſt cauſe preceding. And this is ſo evident a Truth, that* A. C. *cannot deny it, for he ſays it is moſt true.* P. 142. n. 6.

Theſe paſſages I have laid together, that the Reader may clearly underſtand the full ſtate of this great Controverſie concerning *Schiſm*; the upſhot of which is, that it is agreed between both parties, that all ſeparation from communion with a *Church*, doth not involve in it the guilt of *Schiſm*, but only ſuch a ſeparation as hath no ſufficient *cauſe* or *ground* for it. So that the Queſtion comes to this, Whether your *Church* were not guilty of ſuch errours and corruptions, as gave ſufficient cauſe for ſuch a ſeparation. The Queſtion being thus ſtated, we now come to conſider how you make good your part in it.

§. 2. Your firſt pretence is (if reduced into argument, for you ſeem to have a particular *pique* againſt a cloſe way of diſputeing) *That your Church is a right and orthodox Church, and therefore could never give any juſt cauſe of ſeparation from it.* For the Lady asked (as *A. C.* would have it) *Whether the* Roman *Church was not the right Church; not, be not, but, was not;* that is, relating to the times, before the breach was made. P. 131. n. 5. Now his Lordſhip tells him, *That as to the termes he might take his choice; For the Church of* Rome *neither is, nor was the right Church, as the Lady deſired to hear. A particular Church it is, and was, and in ſome times right, and in ſome times wrong: but the right Church, or the Holy Catholick Church, it never was, nor ever can be. And therefore was not ſuch before* Luther *and others left it, or were thruſt from it. A particular Church it was; but then* A. C. *is not diſtinct enough here neither. For the Church of* Rome, *both was, and was not a right or orthodox Church before* Luther *made a breach from it. For the word* ante, *before, may look upon* Rome, *and that Church a great way off, or long before; and then in the prime times of it, it was a moſt right and orthodox Church. But it may look alſo nearer home, and upon the immediate times, before* Luther, *or ſome ages before that: and then in thoſe times* Rome *was a corrupt and tainted Church, far from being Right. And yet both theſe times, before* Luther *made his breach.* And ſo he concludes that Section with this clauſe, *That the* Roman *Church which was once right, is now become wrong, by embracing ſuperſtition and error.* And what ſay you now to all this? Two things you have to return in anſwer to it, or at leaſt to theſe two all that you ſay may be reduced. 1. *That if the* Roman *Church was right once, it is ſo ſtill.* 2. *That if the* Roman *Church were wrong before* Luther, *the Catholick Church was ſo too.* Theſe two containing all that is ſaid in this caſe, muſt be more particularly diſcuſſed.

2. *That if the* Roman *was the right Church, it ſtill is ſo, ſeeing no change can be ſhewn in her Doctrine. If there have been a change, let it appear when, and in what the change was made.* P. 142. Thus you ſay: but you know his Lordſhip never granted, that the *Roman* Church ever was *the right Church* (in the ſenſe you take thoſe words for the *true Catholick Church*;) that it

was once a *right particular Church* he acknowledged, and as ſuch was afterwards tainted with errours and corruptions. If ſo, *you deſire to know what theſe were*, and *when they came in*; to the former I ſhall reſerve an Anſwer till I come to the third part of my task, where you ſhall have an account of them; to the latter, *the time when theſe came in*, becauſe this is ſo much inſiſted on by your party, I ſhall return you an Anſwer in this place. And that I ſhall do in theſe following Propoſitions.

1. *Nothing can be more unreaſonable, than to deny, that errors and corruptions have come into a Church, merely becauſe the punctual time of their coming in cannot be aſſigned.* For, Will any one queſtion the birth of an Infant, becauſe he cannot know the time of his conception? Will any one deny there are tares in the field, becauſe he did not ſee them ſown? and our Saviour hath told us, That the *time of ſowing tares by the enemy, was, when the Men were aſleep.* So we ſay, The errors and corruptions of your *Church* came in, in a time of great *Ignorance*, when little notice was taken of them, and few records reſerved of thoſe times and all the paſſages of them. Since Learning and Religion commonly decay and flouriſh together, How is it poſſible there ſhould be as exact an account given of the decay of Religion, as of the flouriſhing of it? Beſides, Are there not many things you judge errors and corruptions your ſelves, which you can give no account when they firſt entred into the *Church?* As the neceſſity of communicating Infants: name us the perſon who firſt broached that Doctrine, and the time in which it was firſt received in the Church? That no ſouls of Men departed, ſhall ſee *God* till the day of reſurrection, is, I ſuppoſe, with you an error; yet it would puzzle you to find out the firſt Author of it. So for the rebaptizing Hereticks, and many things of a like nature, it is eaſier to ſhew, when they appeared publickly, than when they firſt came into the Church. And as evident it is, in the decay of the primitive Diſcipline of the *Church*, the altering the *orders* of *penitents*, and the *rites* belonging to them, the leaving off the *communicatory Letters* between *Churches*, and many other cuſtoms of the *Church* grown into diſuſe; and yet I ſuppoſe you will not preſume to name the perſons who firſt altered the former orders of the *Church*; and methinks, this is as reaſonable as the naming the punctual time when other corruptions came in. If you ſay, the Primitive *Diſcipline* decayed gradually and inſenſibly; ſo ſay I, that the *Churches* corruptions came in as the other went out, in the ſame gradual and inſenſible manner; and if you cannot name the preciſe time of the one, it is not reaſonable you ſhould expect the other from us.

Mat. 13. 25.

2. *We may have ſufficient reaſon to judge what are errors and corruptions in a Church, though we cannot fix on the time when they came in:* Which is, by comparing them with that Rule of Faith which is delivered down by an uninterrupted tradition to us, and with the practice of the firſt *Ages* of the *Chriſtian Church.* What is apparently contrary to either of theſe, we have reaſon to reject, tho' we cannot determine when it firſt came in. For as long as theſe are our certain *ſtandards*, it matters not who firſt departed from them, as long as we ſee that they have departed. But when we own an abſolute and infallible Rule of Faith and manners, to queſtion Whether any thing contrary to it, be an error or no, becauſe we cannot tell when it firſt began, would be, as if the *Ægyptians*, when they ſaw their Land overflowed by the *Nile*, ſhould queſtion, Whether it were ſo or no, becauſe they could not find out the head of *Nilus*.

3. *They who aſſert their Doctrines and Practices to be Apoſtolical, are bound to ſhew the continued ſucceſſion of them from the Apoſtles times.* And if they

fail

fail in this, upon their own Principles, they muſt be *Errors* and *Corruptions*, though the *punctual time* of their firſt obtaining in the Church, cannot be ſet down. Since therefore you *affirm*, you are bound to *prove*. If you ſay, The judgment of your *Church* being infallible, you need prove no more than that. I anſwer, you muſt prove that this *Infallibility* then, hath been ever received in the *Church*; but if there be not the leaſt footſtep of it in the Records of the ancient *Church*, we juſtly look on this as an *Errour* of the *firſt Magnitude*, though we cannot tell you the Minute of its *firſt riſing*.

4. *We have ſufficient evidence from your ſelves, that many Doctrines and Practices are owned by you, which are of no great antiquity in the Chriſtian Church.* Thus, by the confeſſion of *Scotus*, *Tranſubſtantiation* is no elder than the *Council* of *Lateran*, *Purgatory* not much heard of in the Primitive *Church* by the acknowledgment of *Biſhop Fiſher*, *Communion* in *one kind* confeſſed by moſt to be contrary to the Primitive Practice and Inſtitution, *Prayer in an unknown tongue* can be no elder than the general diſuſe of the *Latin Tongue* in the *Roman Provinces*. And ſo for many others, for which we have the Confeſſions of your own Party; but I need not inſiſt upon that, ſince your very Doctrine of the *Churches* power to declare Matters of Faith, may make things *neceſſary* in one *Age*, which were not in a foregoing, and, in that caſe, ſure it is no great difficulty to tell you, when ſome things of *School-points* became *neceſſary Doctrines*; but then the Queſtion goes off from the *time* to the *matter*, Whether any thing declared by your *Church* can be an Errour: But of that enough hath been ſaid already.

5. *There may be a ſufficient account given, why the beginnings of Errours and Corruptions in your Church have been ſo obſcure*; *becauſe* they came not in all of a ſudden, but ſome at one time, ſome at another, *becauſe* they riſe gradually, as is apparent in *Invocation* of *Saints*, and *Worſhip* of *Images*, *becauſe* many of thoſe things which ended in great *Corruptions*, were taken up at firſt out of good deſigns, to win more upon the *Gentile* World, *becauſe* many things were at firſt practiſed *freely*, which afterwards were urged as *neceſſary*; *becauſe Barbariſm* came into the *Church* along with theſe *Corruptions*; *becauſe* many who gave occaſion to them, were Perſons of great eſteem in their age, and others ſtrove to follow their example more than the Rule; *becauſe* the State of the *Church* did very much alter from it ſelf in ſeveral Ages, which altered Mens apprehenſions and judgments of things, in regard of their ſuitableneſs and neceſſity; *becauſe* thoſe Perſons who brought in, and contended for theſe things, were the Perſons chiefly in power then in the *Church*, which hindered their being caſt out of Communion as others had been; *becauſe* a long time moſt of theſe errours and corruptions, were but the private opinions and practices of a Faction, though then the more prevalent in the *Church*, and therefore not ſo vehemently oppoſed in the firſt *riſe* of them, as when this impoſthumated matter was grown to a head, and then there was a neceſſity of lancing it. Theſe, and ſeveral other reaſons might be given, why the firſt *originals* of *Errours* and *Corruptions* in your *Church*, cannot with ſo much clearneſs be manifeſted, as that they were Errours and Corruptions: Although ſuch, who would take the pains to travel in an argument of that nature, might with very great probability, trace the moſt both of your Errours and Corruptions to the Time and Age, when they were firſt publickly owned and received. But thus much may here ſuffice as to your demand, *That if your Church be not the ſame ſhe was, we ſhould mention the time, when the change was made.* As though *Chronical* Diſtempers could not be known, unleſs we could ſet down the punctual *time* of their

firſt *onſet*. The diſtempers of your *Church* are *Hectical*, I wiſh not in that reſpect, that *they are ſeldom fully diſcovered, till they be incurable.*

§. 3. 2. You anſwer, *That if your Church hath erred, the Catholick Church hath done ſo too*; for which you ſay two things, 1. *That in this diſpute the* Roman
P. 142. n. 1. *Church, and the Catholick Church, are all one.* 2. *That then there was no one viſible Church untainted, uncorrupt, right, orthodox throughout the whole World.* 1. You learnedly tell us, *That the* Roman *and Catholick Church are all one in this Diſpute*, and moſt diſcreetly tell his Lordſhip, *That he begs the Queſtion in ſuppoſing the contrary*; but you know whoſe arts thoſe are to charge their Neighbours with that, they were ſure to be told of themſelves, if the other had ſpoke firſt. But very worthily you prove this, from D. *Stapleton*, who offers to confirm his aſſertion by that which overthrows yours. He ſays, *That amongſt the Ancients, the* Roman *Church, and the Catholick Church were taken for the ſame, and his reaſon is, becauſe the Communion of the* Roman *Church was moſt certainly and evidently with the whole Catholick.* And, Can any thing then be more plain, than that the *Roman* and *Catholick Church* were not the ſame? For, Can any thing be the meaſure of it ſelf? If it were therefore *Catholick*, *becauſe* agreeing with the *Catholick Church*, then it was not *cauſally the Catholick Church*, but only by way of Communion and Participation. If I ſhould ſay, That a Man and a Living-creature are the ſame, and ſhould give this reaſon for it, becauſe Man agrees in every thing with the nature of a Living-creature; doth this imply, that the formal notion of Man, and a Living-creature, are the ſame? Or only that Man partakes ſo much of the properties of a Living-creature, that he may well receive the denomination? So it is here with the *Roman Church*, that might well be called *Catholick* by the *Ancients*, becauſe it did partake of the properties of the *Catholick Church*, but not as though the *formal Reaſon* of a *Churches* being *Catholick*, came from partaking of Communion with the *Roman Church*; as you aſſert, wherein you are diametrically oppoſite to *Stapleton*, for he makes the reaſon, why the *Roman Church* was *Catholick*, to be, becauſe it had Communion with the *Catholick Church*. By which it is evident, that the notion of the *Catholick Church* was much larger than that of the *Roman Church*. Beſides, *Stapleton* only ſaith, *That the Ancients thought ſo*, and ſurely they thought ſo only of the *Roman Church* of their own time; which might then have certain Communion with the *Catholick Church*, and yet not have ſo in the next Age enſuing; therefore though the *Catholick Church* continue ever the ſame, and incorrupt, it will by no means follow, that the *Roman Church* muſt do ſo too. Whatever *A. C.* or you underſtand by the *Catholick Church*, is not, as you elſewhere phraſe it, a *ſtraws matter*, unleſs you proved better than you have done, that the proper notion of the *Holy Catholick Church*, is the ſame with *thoſe who agree with the Church of* Rome *in Doctrine and Communion.* Which is your fundamental miſtake, and a thing you would fain have taken for granted, without the leaſt ſhadow of a ſolid proof.

§. 4. But there may be more force in your ſecond Anſwer, *That if the* Ro-
P. 143. man *Church were wrong and corrupted, it follows, that not only for ſome time, but for many Ages before* Luther, *yea even up to the Apoſtles times, there was no one viſible Church untainted, uncorrupt, right, orthodox throughout the whole World.* It were worth our while to know what you mean by *no one viſible Church*; Do you think they are, or may be, more *viſible Churches* than one, taking the *viſible Church* in its proper ſenſe for the *Catholick viſible Church*; If this be your meaning in general, how unhappily ſoever it be expreſſed, *viz. that then it follows, there could be no viſible Church at*

all with whom we might have Communion; I ſee not how it is proved by what you bring: But if this be all you aim at (for no further your Arguments will carry you) that there was *no one viſible Church untainted*, i. e. *no one Church of a diſtinct Communion from other Churches* altogether free from error; I ſee no ſuch dangerous conſequence in the owning it. But if it were ſo, when *Luther* began to oppoſe the *Corruptions* of the *Church* of *Rome*, How doth it follow that it muſt be ſo *even up to the Apoſtles times?* But we ought to ſee, how you prove your aſſertion. *For if in all thoſe Ages the* Roman *Church were wrong, corrupted, and tainted; and all thoſe likewiſe that diſagreed from her*, viz. Huſſites, Albigenſes, Waldenſes, Wicklevites, Greeks, Abyſſins, Armenians, &c. *had in them corrupt Doctrine during thoſe Ages (as 'tis certain they had, neither could the Relator deny it) I ſay, If the* Roman *Church was thus corrupt; it follows, that not only for ſome time, but for many Ages before* Luther, *yea even up to the Apoſtles times, there was no one Viſible Church untainted, incorrupt, right, and orthodox, throughout the whole World. And conſequently, that during the ſaid Ages, every good Chriſtian was in conſcience obliged in ſome point of Chriſtian belief or other, to contradict the Doctrine, and deſert the Communion of all Viſible Churches in the World*, &c. *Whence it would further follow, that Schiſm or Separation from the external Communion of the whole Church might be not only lawful, but even neceſſary; which is impoſſible, as being contrary to the very eſſential predicates of Schiſm, which is defined to be, A voluntary or wilful departure (ſuch as no juſt cauſe, or reaſon, can be given of it) from the Communion of the whole Church.* Three things this Diſcourſe of yours may be reſolved into. 1. *That if in* Luther's *time the* Roman *Church was corrupt, then there was no one viſible Church uncorrupt.* 2. *That if ſo, it follows that there was none uncorrupt even up to the Apoſtles times.* 3. *That if there were no one Viſible Church uncorrupt, then it was neceſſary to ſeparate from the external Communion of the whole Church.* To every one of theſe I ſhall return a peculiar and diſtinct Anſwer. To the *firſt* I ſay, That the utmoſt you can prove from hence, is, That there was *no one Church of any diſtinct Communion from others*, which was free from all errours. And what great abſurdity is there in ſaying ſo? Unleſs you could prove, that there muſt be *ſome one Church* in all Ages of the World, which muſt be free from all kind or poſſibility of errour. And when you have done this, I ſhall acknowledge it abſurd to ſay the contrary; but otherwiſe that very ſuppoſition ſeems to have the greater abſurdity in it; becauſe it reſtrains the utmoſt ſuppoſable priviledges of the *truly Catholick Church*, to a *particular Church of ſome one denomination.* What then if we grant that in *Luther's* time, there was *no one Viſible Church* free from errours and corruptions? What if we ſhould ſay, in our own times? What if, in elder times? For that which is poſſible to be, may be ſuppoſed actually in any time. If it be poſſible for one particular *Church* to fall into *Errours* and *Corruptions*, Why is it not for another? (unleſs ſome particular priviledge of *Infallibility* be pretended; but that is not our preſent Queſtion) If it be poſſible for every *particular Church* to fall into *errour*, Why may not that poſſibility come into act in one *Age*, as well as ſeveral? Is there any promiſe that there ſhall be a ſucceſſion and courſe of erring in *Churches*, that one *Church* muſt err for one Age, and another for the next? But that it ſhall never fall out, that by any means whatſoever they ſhall err together? If there be no ſuch promiſe to the contrary, the reaſon of the thing will hold, that they may all err at the ſame time. *No*, ſay you, *for then it would follow, that the Catholick Church might err.* To that I anſwer, 1. Either you mean by that, that all Societies in the *Chriſtian*

World

World may concur in the ſame *errour*, or elſe that *ſeveral* of them may have ſeveral *errours*; and this latter is it only which you prove, for you do not ſuppoſe that the *Romaniſts*, *Huſſites*, *Albigenſes*, &c. were all guilty of the ſame *errours*, but that theſe ſeveral *Societies* were guilty of ſeveral *errours*; and therefore from hence it follows not, that they may all concur in the ſame *errour*, which is the only way to prove that the *Church as Catholick* may err, for otherwiſe you only prove, that the ſeveral particular *Churches*, which make up the *Catholick*, may fall into errour. 2. Suppoſing all theſe *Churches* ſhould agree in one errour (which is more than you have proved, or, it may be, can) have you proved that they concur in ſuch an *errour*, which deſtroys the *Being* of the *Catholick Church?* For you would do well to evince, that the Church is ſecured from any but ſuch errours which deſtroy its Being; for the means of proving, That the *Catholick Church* cannot err, are built on the promiſes of its *perpetuity*; now thoſe can only prove that the *Church* is ſecured from *Fundamental Errours*, for thoſe are ſuch only which deſtroy its Being. And ſo his Lordſhip tells you,

P. 139. ſect. 18. n. 5. *That the whole Church cannot univerſally err in the Doctrine of Faith, is moſt true, and granted by divers Proteſtants (ſo you will but underſtand its not erring in abſolute Fundamental Doctrines)* and this he proves, *from that promiſe of Chriſt, That the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* So that the *Catholick Church's* not erring, and the *perpetuity* of the *Catholick Church* do with us,

P. 141. mean the ſame thing. For his Lordſhip grants, *That ſhe may err in ſuperſtructures and deductions, and other By, and unneceſſary Truths, if her curioſity, or other weakneſs, carry her beyond, or cauſe her to fall ſhort of her Rule.* There is then a great difference between ſaying, *That the Catholick Church cannot err*, which is no more than to ſay, *That there ſhall be always a Catholick Church*, and ſaying, *That there muſt be always ſome one Viſible Church*, which muſt be free from all Errour and Corruption. For this we deny, and you produce no reaſon at all to prove it. Granting, that all particular *Churches*, whether of *Romaniſts*, *Greeks*, or others, are ſubject to Errours and Corruptions, we aſſert no more of them, than you grant your ſelves, that any *particular Church* is ſubject to; for the only ground why you would have your *Church* exempt from errour, is, the ſuppoſing her not to be a *particular*, but the *Catholick Church*, which implies, that if ſhe were only a *particular Church* (as ſhe is no more) ſhe might be ſubject to *errours* as well as other *Churches*. And what incongruity then there is in aſſerting, that there may be *no one viſible Church* of any particular *denomination* free from all Errour and Corruption, I cannot underſtand.

§. 5. But further, you ſay, *If there were no one Viſible Church then free from errour, it follows, not only for ſome time, but for many Ages before* Luther, *yea even up to the Apoſtles times, there was no one Viſible Church untainted throughout the whole World.* Not to meddle with the truth of the thing, Whether there were ſo or no, the conſequence is that, we are now to examine, that if it were ſo in *Luther's* time, it muſt be ſo *even up to the Apoſtles times.* The proof of which depends upon the impoſſibility of a *Churches* degeneracy in Faith or Manners, and ſo ſuppoſeth the thing in queſtion, that there muſt be ſome *one viſible Church* abſolutely exempt from all impoſſibility of Errour. For otherwiſe that might be *true* in one *Age*, which might not in another. For although we ſay, that particular *Churches* may err, and be corrupt, we do not ſay, that it is neceſſary they ſhould always be ſo. For, in ſome Age particular *Churches* may be free from errour and corruption, and yet in another Age be overſpread with them. And thus we aſſert it to have been with the *Roman Church*: For his Lordſhip ſaith, *In the prime*

Times it was a moſt right and orthodox Church, but in the immediate Times before Luther, *or in ſome Ages before that it was a corrupt and tainted Church:* And ſo in thoſe Times in which it was right, thoſe might be *heretical* who did not communicate with it, not meerly becauſe they did not communicate with it, but becauſe in not communicating with *a right and orthodox Church* they ſhewed themſelves guilty of ſome *Errour* or *Corruption.* We ſee then, there is no Connexion in the World in the Parts of your Conſequence, *That if it were ſo at one Time, it muſt be ſo always; if in the Time of* Luther, *it muſt be ſo even up to the Apoſtles Times.*

3. From hence you ſay it will follow, *That it will be neceſſary to ſeparate from the external Communion of the whole Church.* I anſwer, there can be no Separation from *the whole Church*, but in ſuch Things wherein the *Unity* of the *whole Church* lies; for *Separation* is a Violation of ſome *Union:* Now when Men ſeparate from the *Errours* of all particular *Churches*, they do not ſeparate from *the Whole*, becauſe thoſe Things which one ſeparates from thoſe particular *Churches* for, are not ſuch, as make all them put together to be the *Whole*, or *Catholick Church.* This muſt be ſomewhat further explained. There are two Things conſiderable in all particular *Churches*; thoſe Things which belong to it as *a Church*, and thoſe Things which belong to it as *a particular Church.* Thoſe Things which belong to it as *a Church*, are the common *Ligaments* or *Grounds* of *Union* between all particular *Churches*, which taken together, make up the *Catholick Church:* Thoſe Things which belong to it as *a particular Church*, are ſuch as it may retain the Eſſence of a Church without. Now, I ſay, Whoſoever ſeparates from any particular *Church* (much more from all) for ſuch Things without which that can be no *Church*, ſeparates from the Communion of the *Catholick Church*; but he that ſeparates only from particular *Churches* as to ſuch Things which concern not their *Being*, is only ſeparated from the *Communion* of thoſe *Churches*, and not the *Catholick.* And therefore, ſuppoſing that all particular Churches have ſome Errours and Corruptions in them, though I ſhould ſeparate from *them all*, I do not ſeparate from the *Communion* of the *whole Church*, unleſs it be for ſomething, without which thoſe could be no *Churches.* An Evidence of which, is, That by my declaring the Grounds of my Separation to be ſuch *Errours* and *Corruptions*, which are crept into the Communion of ſuch *Churches*, and impoſed on me in order to it, I withal declare my Readineſs to joyn with them again, if thoſe Errours and Corruptions be left out. And where there is this Readineſs of *Communion*, there is no abſolute Separation from the *Church* as ſuch, but only *ſuſpending Communion* 'till ſuch Abuſes be reformed. Which is therefore more properly a *Separation* from the *Errours*, than the *Communion* of ſuch a *Church.* Wherefore, if we ſuppoſe, That *there is no one viſible Church* whoſe Communion is not tainted with ſome Corruptions, tho' if theſe Corruptions be enjoyned as Conditions of Communion, I cannot communicate with any of thoſe *Churches*, yet it follows not, that I am ſeparated from the *external Communion of the Catholick Church*, but that I only *ſuſpend Communion* with thoſe particular *Churches* 'till I may ſafely joyn with them, As, Suppoſe all the particular Men I can converſe with, were infected with *Leproſie*, my not aſſociating with them, doth not imply that I am ſeparated from the Communion of all Mankind, but that I am loth to be infected as they are, and therefore withdraw my ſelf 'till I can meet with ſuch healthful Perſons with whom I may ſafely aſſociate again. And if ſeveral other Perſons be of the ſame Mind with me, and we therefore joyn together, Do we therefore divide our ſelves from the whole World by only taking Care of our own Safety? And eſpecially if any

Company of ſuch leprous Perſons ſhould reſolve, That none ſhould live among them, but ſuch as would eat of thoſe Meats which brought that Diſtemper upon them; our withdrawing our ſelves, and aſſociating without them will ſtill appear more reaſonable and commendable. Therefore we ſay, We do not neceſſarily ſeparate from all *Churches* that have Errours or Corruptions in them, ſuppoſing thoſe Errours and Corruptions be not *impoſed* on us, as *Conditions* of *Communion*; and thence, tho' we ſhould grant *No one viſible Church* free from Taint or Corruption, yet it is not neceſſary we ſhould ſeparate from them all: For we may lawfully joyn in Communion with *Churches* having Errours and Corruptions, if our joyning be not an Approbation of them. Thus tho' the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Albigenſes*, *Abyſſins* may have ſome Errours and Corruptions, yet if they be not Fundamental, and be not enjoyned as neceſſary to be approved in order to their Communion, notwithſtanding them, we may lawfully communicate with them. It doth not then at all follow, That if there may be *no one viſible Church* free from Errour and Corruption, it would be neceſſary to ſeparate from the *Communion of the Catholick Church*: Becauſe, 1. All thoſe particular *Churches* may not make thoſe Errours Conditions of Communion. 2. Tho' they did, we ſeparate not from them as *Catholick*, but as corrupt and erroneous *particular Churches*. And therefore you might have ſpared your Labour in telling us from the Holy Fathers, and the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Hammond*, *That it can never be lawful to ſeparate from the Catholick Church*, for we aſſert the ſame, but have made it appear, that it follows not from the Premiſes which were laid down.

§. 6. His Lordſhip having ſaid, *That the* Roman *Church before* Luther *was a corrupt and tainted Church*, in his Margin produceth a Citation to that Purpoſe of Cardinal *de Alliaco*, who acknowledgeth *Infinite Abuſes, Schiſms and Hereſies to prevail over the Chriſtian World; ſo that it is plain, The Church of God ſtands in need of due Reformation.* From which his Lordſhip ſaith, *That it will hardly ſink into any Man's Judgment that ſo great a Man as* Pet. de Alliaco *was in that Church, ſhould ſpeak thus, if he did not ſee ſome Errours in the Doctrine of that Church, as well as the Manners.* To this you anſwer, *That he ſpeaks not of falſe Doctrines taught by the* Roman *Church, but of Schiſms and Hereſies raiſed againſt the Church (not foſtered by her) in all Parts of* Chriſtendom. But I appeal to any indifferent Reader of this Teſtimony, Whether he can conceive that the Cardinal intended to acquit or accuſe the *Roman Church* in thoſe Words of his. For taking them in your Senſe, they muſt contain a high *Commendation* of the *Roman Church*, that in the midſt of ſo many *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* raiſed againſt her, ſhe preſerved her Faith entire; and think you that he that ſaid, The *Church of God* needed Reformation, thought there was nothing in the *Church* which ſtood in need of it? And therefore this Teſtimony doth ſufficiently prove that the *Roman Church* was a tainted and corrupted *Church*.

Cum infiniti Abuſus, Schiſmata quoq; & Hæreſes, per totum nunc Chriſtianum Orbem invaleſcant; Eccleſiam Dei legitimâ indigere Reformatione, nemini non apertum erit. Petrus de Alliaco, lib. de Reform. Eccleſ.

P. 143.

If there be ſufficient Evidence, *That there are Tares ſown in the Church of Rome*, it is not to much Purpoſe to enquire, *Whether they were ſown while the Biſhops ſlept?* or, *Whether they themſelves did not help to ſow them.* But it ſeems *in their private Capacities they might ſow them, as private Doctors*, and then it is not likely that in their publick Capacity they would pluck them up. *If the Catholick Faith only*, as you tell us, *oblige us to maintain that the Pope is Infallible when he defines a General Council*; then there will be Opportunity enough for Errours to be ſown and grow up in the Interval of ſuch Definitions. But you further add, *That tho' this be all which Men are obliged to maintain* (for no

no Man can be bound to Impoſſibilities) *yet that it is a very pious Opinion to hold, That no Popes have perſonally erred as private Doctors, i.e.* You have a very good mind to maintain it, if you knew how; for that is the Meaning of your pious Opinion. For if you thought it had been defenſible, no doubt it had been *de Fide* long ago. But it was hard thwarting the Records of former Ages, wherein the *Errours* of *Popes*, and their mutual *Contradictions* are ſo viſible to all that ſearch after them, and therefore it was wiſely concluded that this ſhould not be held *de Fide*, but if any would venture upon a Thing ſo acceptable at *Rome* as *perſonal Infallibility* is, it ſhould be accounted a very *pious* Undertaking. And accordingly *Bellarmine* hath with the greateſt Care and Induſtry endeavour'd it in ſeveral Chapters; but, as his Lordſhip truly ſaith, *All* Bellarmine's *Labour, tho' great and full of Art, is not able to waſh them clean.* And this (if you had undertaken the Defence of *Bellarmine*) ſhould have been made good; but ſince you are ſo cautious as not to think your ſelf obliged to do it, I commend your Diſcretion in it, and proceed. I cannot ſee that his Lordſhip is guilty of a falſe Quotation of *Bellarmine* for that Saying, *Et Papas quoſdam graves Errores ſeminaſſe in Eccleſiâ Chriſti, Luce clarius eſt*, for he doth not ſeem at all to cite *Bellarmine* for it; but having cited the Place juſt before, where he endeavours to vindicate the Popes from all Errours; he adds this Expreſſion, as directly contrary to his Deſign, that tho' he had endeavoured ſo much to clear them from Errours, yet that they had ſown ſome grievous Errors in the Church was as clear as the Day; and as it immediately follows is proved by *Jac. Almain*, &c. And therefore it was only your own Oſcitancy which made you ſet it in the Contents of your Chapter, *That Cardinal* Bellarmine *was moſt falſly quoted by him.* But that Falſeneſs which with ſo much Confidence you charge his Lordſhip with, rebounds with greater Force on your ſelf, when you ſay, *That* Almain *ſpeaks not of Errors in Faith at all, but only of Errours, or rather Abuſes in Point of Manners*; whereas he not only aſſerts but largery proves, *That the Pope may err, not only perſonally, but judicially*, and in the ſame Chapter brings that remarkable Inſtance of the evident Contradiction between the Definitions of Pope *Nicolaus* III. and *John* XXII. And *Platina* tells us, That *John* XXII. *declared them to be Hereticks who held according to the former Definition.* And is this only concerning ſome Abuſes in point of Manners, and not concerning Errours in Faith that *Almain* ſpeaks? You might as well ſay ſo of *Lyra*, who ſaid, *That many Popes have apoſtatized from the Faith*; of *Cuſanus*, who ſaith, *That both in a direct and collateral Line, ſeveral Popes have fallen into Hereſie*; of *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, who ſaith, *That the beſt Friends of the Popes believe they may err in Faith*; of *Carranza*, who ſays, *No one queſtions but the Pope may be an Heretick*; of *Canus*, who ſays, *It is not to be denyed but that the chief Biſhop may be an Heretick, and that there are Examples of it:* You might as well, I ſay, affirm that all theſe ſpake only of Abuſes in Manners, and not Errours in Faith, as you do of *Almain*. Neither will your other Subterfuge ſerve your turn, *That they taught Errours in Doctrine as private Men*; for, *Alphonſus à Caſtro* expreſly affirms in the Caſe of Pope *Cœleſtine*, about the Diſſolution of Marriage in Caſe of Hereſie, *That it cannot be ſaid that he erred thro' Negligence, and as a private Perſon, and not as Pope*; For (ſaith he) *this Definition is extant in the Decretals, and he had ſeen it himſelf.* Although the contrary to this were afterwards defined not only by Pope *Innocent* III. but by the *Council of Trent*. And hence it appears,

Papa poteſt errare, errore judiciali; de perſonali, omnibus notum eſt. Jac. Almain. de Auctorit. Eccleſ. cap 10.

Quorum unus determinavit, judicialiter, Chriſtum & Apoſtolos nihil habuiſſe in communi nec in proprio; alter, oppoſitum. Id. ib.

Lyra in Matth. 16. Cuſan. Concord. l. 1. c. 12. Alphonſ. c. Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 2. Carranz. Controv. 4. Canus loc. Com. l. 6. c. ult.

De Hæreſ. l. 1. c. 4.

P. 144. whatever you pretend to the contrary, *That there may be Tares ſown in the Church of* Rome, *not only by private Perſons, but by the publick Hands of the Popes too*, if they themſelves may be believed, who elſe do moſt infallibly contradict each other. But whether theſe Errours came in at firſt thro' Negligence or publick Definitions is not ſo material to our Purpoſe; for which it is ſufficient to prove, That the Church of *Rome* may be tainted and corrupted, which may be done one way as well as the other. As Corn Fields may be over-run with Tares, tho' no one went purpoſely to ſow them there. And ſo much is acknowledged by *Caſſander*, when he ſpeaks of the ſuperſtitious Practices uſed in your Church, *That thoſe who ſhould have redreſſed theſe Abuſes, were, if not the Authors, yet the Encouragers of them for their own Advantage*; by which Means, Errours and Corruptions may ſoon grow to a great Height in a Church tho' they were never ſown by publick Definitions. And when you diſparage *Caſſander*'s Teſtimony, by telling us how little his Credit is among Catholicks, you thereby let us ſee how much your Church is over-run with Corruptions, when none among you can ſpeak againſt them, but they preſently forfeit their Reputation.

Caſſand. Conſult. art. 21.

N. 3. The Caſe of the *Schiſm* at *Rome* between *Cornelius* and *Novatianus*, and the Employment of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* from St. *Cyprian* thither, doth belong to the former Chapter, where it hath been fully diſcourſed of already, and muſt not be repeated here. Only thence we ſee, That *Rome* is as capable of a *Schiſm* within her own Bowels as any other Church is, which is abundantly atteſted by the Multitudes of *Schiſms*; which happened afterwards between the Biſhops of that See. But this being inſiſted on by his Lordſhip in the former Controverſy of the *Catholick Church*, doth not refer to this Chapter, wherein the *Cauſes* of our *Separation* ſhould be enquired into.

§. 7. Which at laſt you come to, and *paſſing by the verbal Diſpute between* A. C. N. 4. *ibid.* *and his Lordſhip about what was ſpoken at the Conference*, you tell us, *It more concerns you to ſee what could or can be ſaid in this Point.* You draw up therefore a large and formal Charge of *Schiſm* againſt us in your following Words: *Our Aſſertion*, ſay you, *is*; but, good *Sir*, it is not what you *aſſert*, but what you *prove*. It were an eaſie Matter for us to draw up a far larger Bill againſt your *Church*, and tell you *Our Aſſertion is*, That you are the greateſt *Schiſmaticks* in the World. Would you look on it as ſufficiently proved becauſe we aſſerted it? I pray think the ſame of us, for we are not apt to think our ſelves guilty of *Schiſm* at all the more, becauſe you tell us what your *Aſſertion is*. If this be your Way of Dealing with us, your firſt *Aſſertion* had need be, That you are Infallible; but ſtill that had need be more than aſſerted, for unleſs it be infallibly proved we ſhould not believe it. But however, we muſt ſee what *your Aſſertion is*, that we may at leaſt underſtand from you the State of the preſent Controverſy. Your *Aſſertion* therefore *is*, *That Proteſtants made this Rent or Schiſm, by their obſtinate and pertinacious maintaining erroneous Doctrines, contrary to the Faith of the Roman or Catholick Church: By their rejecting the Authority of their lawful Eccleſiaſtical Superiors both immediate and mediate: By aggregating themſelves into a ſeparate Body or Company of pretended Chriſtians, independent of any Paſtors at all, that were in lawful and quiet Poſſeſſion of Juriſdiction over them: By making themſelves Paſtors and Teachers of others, and adminiſtring Sacraments without Authority given them by any that were lawfully impowr'd to give it: By inſtituting new Rites and Ceremonies of their own in Matter of Religion, contrary to thoſe antiently received throughout all* Chriſtendom: *By violently excluding and diſpoſſeſſing other Prelates and Paſtors of and from their reſpective Sees, Cures and Benefices:*

P. 145.

Benefices; and intruding themſelves into their Places in every Nation where they could get footing, the ſaid Prelates and Paſtors for the moſt part yet living. Theſe are your Aſſertions, and becauſe you ſeek not to prove them, it ſhall be ſufficient to oppoſe ours to them. Our Aſſertion therefore is, that the *Church* and *Court* of *Rome* are guilty of this *Schiſm*, by obtruding erroneous Doctrines and ſuperſtitious Practices, as the Conditions of her *Communion*; by adding ſuch *Articles of Faith* which are contrary to the plain Rule of Faith, and repugnant to the Senſe of the truly *Catholick* and not the *Roman Church*; by her intolerable Incroachments and Uſurpations upon the Liberties and Privileges of particular *Churches*, under a vain Pretence of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*; by forcing Men if they would not damn their Souls by ſinning againſt their Conſciences in approving the Errours and Corruptions of the *Roman Church*, to joyn together for the Solemn Worſhip of *God* according to the Rule of *Scripture* and Practice of the *Primitive Church*; and ſuſpending Communion with that Church till thoſe Abuſes and Corruptions be redreſſed. In which they neither deny Obedience to any Lawful *Authority* over them, nor take to themſelves any other Power than the *Law of God* hath given them, receiving their Authority in a conſtant Succeſſion from the *Apoſtles*: they inſtitute no Rites and Ceremonies either contrary to, or different from the Practice of the *Primitive Church*; they neither exclude or diſpoſſeſs others of their Lawful Power, but in caſe others neglect their Office, they may be notwithſtanding obliged to perform theirs in order to the *Churches Reformation*. Leaving the *Supreme Authority* of the Kingdom or Nation to order and diſpoſe of ſuch Things in the *Church* which of right appertain unto it. And this we aſſert to be the Caſe of *Schiſm*, in reference to the *Church of England*, which we ſhall make good in oppoſition to your Aſſertions, where we meet with any thing that ſeems to contradict the whole or any part of it. *Theſe and the like Practices of yours* (to uſe your own Words) *not any obſtinate maintaining any erroneous Doctrines*, as you vainly pretend, we aver to have been the true and real Cauſes of that Separation which is made between your Church and ours. And you truly ſay, *That Proteſtants were thruſt out of your Church*; which is an Argument they did not voluntarily forſake the Communion of it, and therefore are no *Schiſmaticks*; but your Carriage and Practices were ſuch as forced them to join together in a diſtinct Communion from you. And it was not we who left your *Church*, but your *Church* that left her Primitive Faith and Purity in ſo high a manner, as to declare all ſuch excommunicate who will not approve of and join in her greateſt Corruptions, though it be ſufficiently manifeſt that they are great Receſſions from the Faith, Piety, and Purity of that *Roman Church* which was planted by the *Apoſtles*, and had ſo large a Commendation from the Apoſtolical Men of thoſe firſt Ages. Since then ſuch Errors and Corruptions are enforced upon us as Conditions of Communion with you, by the ſame reaſon that the *Orthodox* did very well in departing from the *Arians*, becauſe the *Arians* were already departed from the *Church* by their falſe Doctrine; will our Separation from you be juſtified who firſt departed from the Faith and Purity of the Primitive *Church*; and not only ſo, but thruſt out of your *Communion* all ſuch as would not depart from it as far as you.

§. 8. P. 145. Having thus conſidered and retorted your Aſſertions, we come to your Anſwers. *Nor* (ſay you) *does the Biſhop vindicate the Proteſtant Party, by ſaying, The Cauſe of Schiſm was ours, and that we Catholicks thruſt Proteſtants from us, becauſe they call'd for Truth and redreſs of Abuſes. For firſt, there can be no juſt cauſe of Schiſm; this hath been granted already, even by Proteſtants.*

ſtants. And ſo it is by us, and the reaſon is very evident for it, for if there be a *juſt cauſe*, there can be no *Schiſm*, and therefore what you intend by this, I cannot imagine, unleſs it be to free *Proteſtants* from the guilt of *Schiſm*, becauſe they put the Main of their Tryal upon the Juſtice of the *cauſe* which moved them to forſake the Communion of your *Church*; or elſe you would have it taken for granted that ours was a *Schiſm*, and thence infer there could be no juſt *cauſe* of it. As if a Man being accuſed for taking away the Life of one who violently ſet upon him in the High way with an Intent both to rob and deſtroy him, ſhould plead for himſelf that this could be no murther in him, becauſe there was a ſufficient and juſtifiable Cauſe for what he did; that he deſigned nothing but to go quietly on his road; that this Perſon and ſeveral others violently ſet upon him; that he intreated them to deſiſt, that he ſought to avoid them as much as he could, but when he ſaw they were abſolutely bent on his Ruine, he was forced in his own neceſſary Defence to take away the Life of that Perſon; Would not this with any intelligent Jury be looked on as a juſt and reaſonable Vindication? But if ſo wiſe a Perſon as your ſelf had been among them, you would no doubt have better informed them; for you would very gravely have told them, All his Plea went on a falſe Suppoſition, that he had a *juſt cauſe* for what he did, but there could be *no juſt cauſe for Murther*. Do you not ſee now how ſubtil and pertinent your Anſwer is here, by this parallel to it? For as in that Caſe all Men grant that there can be *no juſt cauſe for Murther*, becauſe all Murther is committed without a juſt Cauſe; and if there be one, it ceaſeth to be Murther: So it his here in *Schiſm*, which being a *cauſeleſs Separation* from the *Churches Unity*, I wonder who ever imagined there could be *juſt cauſe* for it. But to rectifie ſuch groſs Miſtakes as theſe are for the future, you would do well to underſtand that *Schiſm* formally taken always imports ſomething criminal in it, and there can be no juſt Cauſe for a *ſin*; but beſides that, there is that which (if you underſtand it) you would call the *materiality* of it, which is the *Separation* of one part of the *Church* from another. Now this, according to the different grounds and reaſons of it, becomes *lawful* or *unlawful*, that is, as the reaſons do make it neceſſary or unneceſſary; For Separation is not *lawful* but when it is *neceſſary*: now this being capable of ſuch a different Nature, that it may be *good* or *evil* according to its Circumſtances, there can be no abſolute Judgment paſſed upon it, till all thoſe Reaſons and Circumſtances be duely examined; and if there be no ſufficient Grounds for it, then it is *formally Schiſm*, *i. e.* a culpable Separation; if there be ſufficient *Cauſe*, then there may be a *Separation*, but it can be no *Schiſm*. And becauſe the *Union* of the *Catholic Church* lies in *Fundamental* and *neceſſary Truths*, therefore there can be no Separation abſolutely from the *Catholick Church* but what involves in it the formal guilt of *Schiſm*; it being impoſſible any Perſon ſhould have juſt Cauſe to diſown the *Churches* Communion for any thing whoſe Belief is neceſſary to Salvation. And whoſoever doth ſo, thereby makes himſelf no Member of the *Church*, becauſe the *Church* ſubſiſts on the Belief of Fundamental Truths. But in all ſuch Caſes wherein a Diviſion may be made, and yet the ſeveral Perſons divided retain the *Eſſentials* of a *Chriſtian Church*, the Separation which may be among any ſuch, muſt be determined according to the Cauſes of it. For it being poſſible of one ſide; that Men may out of capricious Humours and Fancies renounce the Communion of a *Church* which requires nothing but what is juſt and reaſonable; and it being poſſible on the other ſide, that a *Church* calling her ſelf

Catholick

Catholick may so far degenerate in Faith and Practice, as not only to be guilty of great Errors and Corruptions, but to impose them as Conditions of Communion with her, it is necessary where there is a manifest Separation to enquire into the Reasons and Grounds of it; and to determine the Nature of it according to the Justice of the Cause which is pleaded for it. And this I hope may help you a little better to understand, what is meant by such, who say, *There can be no just cause of Schism*; and how little this makes for your Purpose.

§. 9. But you go on and I must follow. *And to his calling for Truth*, &c. *I Answer, What Hereticks ever yet forsook the Church of God, but pretended Truth, and complained they were thrust out, and hardly dealt with, meerly because they called for Truth and redress of Abuses?* And I pray, what *Church* was ever so guilty of Errors and Corruptions, but would call those *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* who found fault with her Doctrine, or separated from her Communion? It is true, *Hereticks pretend Truth, and Schismaticks Abuses*, but is it possible there should be Errors and Corruptions in a *Churches* Communion, or is it not? If not, prove but that of your *Church*, and the Cause is at an end; if it be, we are to examine whether the charge be true or no. For although *Hereticks may pretend Truth*, and others be deceived in judging of it, yet doubtless there is a real Difference between *Truth* and *Error*. If you would never have men quarrel with any Doctrine of your *Church* because *Hereticks have pretended Truth*: would not the same Reason hold, why men should never enquire after *Truth*, *Reason or Religion*, because *Men have pretended* to them all which have not had them. It is therefore a most senseless Cavil to say we have no reason *to call for Truth* because *Hereticks have done so*; and on the same Grounds you must not be called *Catholicks* because *Hereticks* have been called so. But those who have been *Hereticks* were first proved to be so, by making it appear that was a certain *Truth* which they denyed; do you the same by us; prove those which we call *Errors* in your *Church* to be part of the *Catholick* and *Apostolick Faith*; prove those we account *Corruptions*, to be parts of *Divine Worship*, and we will give you leave to call us *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* but not before. *But*, say you, *He should have reflected that the Church of God is styled a City of Truth by the Prophet*, and so it may be, and yet your Church be a Fortress of Error) *And a Pillar and Foundation of Truth by the Apostle*, (but what is this to the Church of *Rome's* being so?) *And by the Fathers, a rich Depository or Treasury of all Divine and Heavenly Doctrines* (so it was in the sense the Fathers took the *Church* in, for the *truly Catholick Christian Church*). And we may use the same Expressions still of the *Church* as the *Prophets*, *Apostles*, and *Fathers* did, and nevertheless charge your *Church* justly *with the want of Truth, and opposition to the preaching of it, and on that ground* justly *forsake her Communion*, which is so far from being *inexcusable Impiety and Presumption*, that it was only the Performance of a necessary Christian Duty. And therefore that *Woe of Scandal*, his Lordship mentioned, still returns upon your Party who gave such just Cause of Offence to the *Christian* World, and making it necessary for all such as aimed at the Purity of the *Christian Church* to leave your Communion, when it could not be enjoyed without making Shipwrack both of Faith and a good Conscience. *And this is so clear and undeniable* (to follow you still in your own Language) that we dare appeal for a Tryal of our Cause *to any Assembly of learned Divines*, or what *Judge* and *Jury* you please, provided they be not some of the Parties accused; and because you

are

are so willing to have *learned Divines*, I hope you will believe the last *Pope Innocent* so far, as not to mention the Pope and Cardinals.

P. 146. What follows in Vindication of *A. C.* from *interfering and shuffling in his Words*, *because timorous and tender Consciences think they can never speak with Caution enough*, *for fear of telling a Lye*, will have the Force of a Demonstration (being spoken *of* and *by* a *Jesuit*) among all those who know what mortal Haters they are of any Thing that looks like a Lye or Æquivocation: And what Reason there is that, of all Persons in the World, they should be judged *Men of timorous and tender Consciences.*

P. 10. But whatever the Words were which passed, you justifie *A. C.* in saying, *That the Protestants did depart from the Church of* Rome, *and got the Name of Protestants by protesting against her. For this* (say you) *is so apparent that the whole World acknowledgeth it.* If you mean that the Communion of Protestants is distinct from yours, Who ever made scruple of confessing it? But because in those Terms of *departing*, *leaving*, *forsaking* your Communion, you would seem to imply that it was a *voluntary Act*, and done without any necessary *Cause* enforcing it, therefore his Lordship denies, *That Protestants did depart*; *for*, saith he, *Departure is voluntary*, *so was not theirs.* But because it is so hard a Matter to explain the Nature of that Separation between your Church and ours, especially in the Beginning of it, without using those Terms or some like them, as when his Lordship saith, *That* Luther *made a Breach from it*; It is sufficient, that we declare, That by none of these Expressions we mean any *causless Separation*, but only such Acts as were necessarily consequential to the imposing your Errors and Corruptions as Conditions of Communion with your Church. To the latter Part

P. 135. N. 3. his Lordship answers, *That the Protestants did not get that Name*, *by protesting against the Church of* Rome, *but by protesting (and that when nothing else would serve) against her Errors and Superstitions. Do you but remove them from the Church of* Rome, *and our Protestation is ended, and our Separation too.* This, you think, will be answered with our old put off, *That it is the common Pretext of all Hereticks*, *when they sever themselves from the* Roman *Catholick Church.* If your Church indeed were what she is not, the *Catholick Church*, we might be what we are not, *Hereticks:* But think it not enough to prove us *Hereticks*, that you call us so, unless you will likewise take it for granted, that the Pope is *Antichrist*, and your Church, *the Whore of* Babylon, because they are as often, and as confidently called so. And if your Church be truly so (as she is shrewdly suspected to be), Do you think she, and all her Followers, would not as confidently call such as dissented from her, *Hereticks*, and the using those Expressions of her, *virulent Execrations against her*, as you do now, supposing her not to be so? What therefore would belong to your Church, supposing her as bad as any Protestants imagine her to be, cannot certainly help to persuade us, That she is not so bad as she is. When you say still, That *Protestants did really depart from the* Roman *Church*, *and in so doing*, *remained separate from the whole Church*, you very fairly beg the Thing in dispute, and think us uncivil for denying it. You know not what that Passage means, *That the Protestants did not voluntarily depart*, *taking their whole Body and Cause together*; since there is no Obscurity in the Expression, but a Defect elsewhere. I can only say, That his Lordship was not bound to find you an Understanding as oft as you want it. But it were an easie Matter to help you; for it is plain, that he speaks those Words to distinguish the common *Cause of Protestants*, from the Heats and Irregularities of some *particular Persons*, whom he did not intend to justifie, such as he saith, *Were either peevish*, *or ignorantly Zealous.*

And

And if you diſtinguiſh the Senſe of your *Church* from the Judgments of particular Perſons, I hope it may be as lawful for us to diſtinguiſh *the body and cauſe of Proteſtants* from the inconſiderate *Actings* of any *particular Men.* All that which follows about the name of *Proteſtants*, which his Lordſhip ſaith, *Took its riſe, not from proteſting ſimply againſt the* Roman *Church, but againſt the Edict at* Worms, *which was for the reſtoring all things to their former ſtate, without any Reformation*, is ſo plain and evident, that nothing but a mind to cavil, and to give us the ſame things over and over, could have made you ſtay longer upon it. For what elſe means your talk of *Innovation in Matters of Religion* (which we ſay, was cauſed by you) *and proteſting againſt the* Roman *Church, and conſequently againſt all particular Viſible Churches in the World, and that which none but Hereticks and Schiſmaticks uſed to do*? Do you think theſe Paſſages are ſo hard, that we cannot know what they mean, unleſs we have them ſo often over? But they are not ſo hard to be underſtood, as to be believed, and that the rather, becauſe we ſee you had rather *ſay* them *often*, than *prove* them *once.* If *the Popes profeſſed Reformation neceſſary as to many Abuſes*, I hope they are not all *Schiſmaticks* who call for the redreſs of Abuſes in your *Church.* But, if all the Reformation we are to expect of them, be that, which you ſay, *was effectually ordained by the Council of* Trent, if there had not been an *Edict* at *Worms*, there were the *Decrees* of that *Council* which would have made a *Proteſtation neceſſary.* Although we think your Church needs *Reformation in Manners and Diſcipline*, as much as any in the World, yet thoſe are not the *Abuſes* mainly inſiſted on by the *Proteſtants*, as the Grounds of their *Separation*, and therefore his Lordſhip ought to be underſtood, of a *Reformation as to the Errors and Corruptions of the* Roman *Church*; and doubtleſs that *Edict* of *Worms* which was for the *reſtoring all things to their former ſtate*, did cut off all hopes of any ſuch *Reformation* as was neceſſary for the *Proteſtants* to return to the *Roman Communion.* And whatever you ſay, till you have proved the contrary better than as yet it is done, it will appear, that they are the *Proteſtants who ſtand for the ancient and undefiled Doctrine of the Catholick Church, againſt the novel and corrupt Tenets* of the *Roman Church.* And ſuch kind of *Proteſtation* no true Chriſtian, who meaſures his being *Catholick*, by better Grounds than Communion with the Church of *Rome*, will ever have cauſe to be aſhamed of.

P. 147.

But A. C. (ſaith his Lordſhip) *goes on, and will needs have it, that the Proteſtants were the cauſe of the Schiſm. For*, (ſaith the) *though the* Church *of* Rome *did thruſt them from her by Excommunication, yet they had firſt divided themſelves by obſtinate holding and teaching Opinions contrary to the* Roman *Faith, and practice of the Church, which to do, S.* Bernard *thinks, is pride, S.* Auſtin, *madneſs.* At this his Lordſhip takes many and juſt Exceptions, 1. *That holding and teaching was not the prime cauſe neither, but the Corruptions and Superſtitions of* Rome, *which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary. So the prime Cauſe was there ſtill.* Now to this your Anſwer is very conſiderable. *That the Biſhop of* Rome *being S.* Peter's *Succeſſor in the Government of the Church, and Infallible (at leaſt with a General Council) it is impoſſible, that Proteſtants or other Sectaries, ſhould ever find ſuch Errors or Corruptions definitively taught by him, or received by the Church, as ſhould either warrant them to preach againſt her Doctrine, or lawfully to forſake her Communion.* We ſay, Your *Church hath erred*; you ſay, It is impoſſible *ſhe ſhould*; we offer you evident Proofs of *her Errors*; you ſay, *She is Infallible*; we ſay, It is impoſſible, that Church ſhould be *Infallible*, which we can make appear hath *been deceived*; you tell us again, It is

§. 11. P. 136. n. 4.

Ibid.

impoſſible *ſhe ſhould be deceived*; for, let *Hereticks* ſay what they will, *ſhe is Infallible.* And if this be not a Satisfactory Way of anſwering, let the World judge. But having already pulled down that *Babel* of *Infallibility*, this Anſwer falls to the Ground with it; and to uſe your Phraſe, *The truth is*, all that you have in effect to ſay for your *Church*, is, that ſhe is *Infallible*, and the *Catholick Church*, and by this means you think to caſt the *Schiſm* upon us; and theſe Things are great enough indeed, if you could but make any ſhew of Proof for them; but not being able to do that, you do in effect as much, as if a Man in a *high Fever* ſhould go about to demonſtrate it was *impoſſible* for him to be *ſick*, which, the more he takes pains to do, the more evident his Diſtemper is to all who hear him. And it is ſhrewdly to be ſuſpected, if your Errors had not been great and palpable, you would have contented your ſelves with ſomething ſhort of Infallibility. But as the Caſe is with your *Church*, I muſt confeſs it is your greateſt Wiſdom to talk moſt of *Infallibility*; for if you can but meet with any weak enough to ſwallow that, all other things go down without diſpute; but if men are left at Liberty to examine Particulars, they would as ſoon believe it was impoſſible for that man to *fall*, whom they ſee *upon the ground*, as your *Church* to be *infallible*, which they find overſpread with Error and Corruptions.

Much ſuch another Anſwer you return to his Lordſhips ſecond Exception, which is, *at his calling the Chriſtian Faith the* Roman *Faith*: For,

Ibid. you ſay, *It is no incongruity ſo to call it, for the Biſhop of* Rome *being Head of the whole Chriſtian or Catholick Church, the Faith approved and taught by him as Head thereof, though it be* de facto, *the general Faith and Profeſſion of all Chriſtians, may yet very well be called the* Roman *Faith; Why? becauſe the Root, Origin, and chief Foundation under Chriſt, of its being practiſed and believed by Chriſtians, is at* Rome. But if the *Biſhop* of *Rome* be no ſuch thing as *Head of the Chriſtian Church* (and they muſt have a very *wide Faith*, which muſt *ſwallow* that *Univerſal Headſhip*, with all the *Appurtenances*, upon your bare Affirmation) if it belongs no more to him to approve and teach the Faith than to any other *Catholick Biſhop*, if the coming from *Rome* affords no Credibility at all to the *Chriſtian Faith*; then ſtill there remains as great an incongruity as may be in calling the *Chriſtian Faith* the *Roman Faith.* And as to all theſe my denial is as good as your Affirmation; when you undertake to prove, I ſhall to anſwer.

If *A. C.* adds *the practice of the Church to the* Roman *Faith*, I ſee no

P. 148. Advantage is gotten by it, for the firſt muſt limit the latter, and the *Faith* being *Roman*, the *Church* muſt be ſo too, and therefore all your Cavils on that Subject come to nothing.

§. 12. P. 137. The third Exception is, *againſt the Places out of S.* Bernard, *and S.* Auſtin, which, his Lordſhip ſaith, *are miſ applied*; *for neither of them* (ſaith he) *ſpake of the* Roman; *and S.* Bernard *perhaps neither of the Catholick, nor the* Roman, *but of a particular Church or Congregation. His Words are, What greater Pride, than that one Man ſhould prefer his judgment before the whole Congregation? Which* A. C. *conveniently to his Purpoſe rendred before the whole Congregation of all the Chriſtian Churches in the World. Whereas no ſuch thing is in him as all the Chriſtian Churches in the World.* And his Lordſhip ſaith, *He thinks it is plain, that he ſpeaks both of, and to the particular Congregation, to which he was then*

Quæ major ſuperbia quam ut unus homo toti Congregationi judicium ſuum præferat, tanquam ipſe ſolus Spiritum Dei habeat? S. Bern. Serm. 3. de Reſurrect.

Ibid. *preaching.* This you deny not, but ſay, *The Argument holds* à minori ad majus, *to ſhew the more exorbitant Pride of thoſe, who prefer their private fanatick*

natick Opinions, before the Judgment of the whole Catholick Church. The *Roman Church* you ſhould have ſaid, for you own no *Catholick Church*, but what is *Roman*, and therein the Argument you mention will hold yet further, againſt thoſe who prefer the *Novel Opinions* of the *Roman Church*, before the ancient *Apoſtolical Faith* of the *truly Catholick Church.* His Lordſhip adds, *That it is one thing to prefer a Man's private Judgment before the whole Congregation; and another, for an intelligent Man in ſomething unſatisfied, modeſtly to propoſe his Doubts even to the Catholick Church. And much more may a whole National Church, nay, the whole Body of Proteſtants do it.* Now you very wiſely leave out this laſt Clauſe, that you might take an Opportunity to declaim againſt *Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, &c.* for want of Modeſty. But what Pretext could there have been for ſuch Virulency, had they been guilty of what you charge them, if you would but have given us all that his Lordſhip ſaid? And may not I now therefore more juſtly return you your own Language in the ſame Page, upon a far leſs Occaſion? *That here's a manifeſt Robbery of part of his Lordſhip's Words, for which you are bound to Reſtitution. For his Lordſhip, as it were, foreſeeing this Cavil, warily adds that concerning a whole National Church, and the whole Body of Proteſtants; which you for Reaſons beſt known to your ſelf, craftily leave out. But we muſt excuſe our Adverſary for this ſlip, though it be an unhandſome one; For the truth is, he had no other way to hide the guiltineſs of his own Pen,* &c. Theſe are your own Words only applied, and that much more juſtly, to your ſelf, for a more palpable Fault in the very ſame Page, wherein you had accuſed his Lordſhip for one of that kind. But you go on further, and *ſuppoſing the Doubts had been modeſtly propoſed, yet this could not at all help the Proteſtant Cauſe, in regard their Doubts were in Points of Faith, already determined for ſuch by Authority of the Catholick Church; to queſtion any of which with what ſeeming Modeſty ſoever is ſinful, heretical, and damnable.* Were it our preſent Buſineſs, it were eaſie to make it appear, that the far greateſt part of the Matters in Controverſie, were never determined *as Points of Faith*, before the *Council of* Trent, and, I hope you will not ſay, that was before the Reformation, or any Propoſal of Doubts? But, if they had been defined by your Church for Matters of Faith, and our great Doubt be, How your Church comes to have this Power of *determining Points of Faith*, to whom ſhould this Doubt be propounded? to your Church, no doubt then we ſhould hear from her, as now we do from you, *That to queſtion it with what ſeeming Modeſty ſoever, is ſinful, heretical, and damnable.* And, Is it not then likely that your Church ſhould ever yield to the Propoſal of Doubts? And you do well to tell us ſo; for it will ſave *Proteſtants* a great deal of Labour, when they ſee your Church ſo incurable, that ſhe makes it *ſinful, heretical, and damnable*, to queſtion any thing ſhe hath determined. Although we do with much more Reaſon aſſert it to be *ſinful, heretical and damnable* in your Church, to offer to obtrude erroneous Doctrines on the Faith of the Chriſtian World, as Points neceſſary to be believed, and to urge ſuperſtitious Practices as the Conditions of Communion with her.

To the place of S. *Auſtin*, wherein he ſaith, *That it is a part of moſt inſolent Madneſs, for any Man to diſpute, Whether that be to be done, which is uſually done in and through the whole Catholick Church of Chriſt.* His Lordſhip anſwers, 1. *Here's not a Word of the* Roman *Church, but of that which is all over the World, Catholick, which* Rome *never yet was*; and for all your boaſt of having often ſhewed, *That the Roman and the Catholick are all one*; I dare leave it to the indifferent Reader, Whether you have not P. 138. P. 149.

miserably failed in your attempts that way. 2. He answers, *That A. C. applies this to the* Roman *Faith, whereas S.* Austin *speaks expresly of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, and particularly about the manner of offering upon* Maundy-Thursday, *whether it be in the Morning, or after Supper, or both.* 3. *'Tis manifest by the Words themselves, that S.* Austin *speaks of no matter of Faith there, Roman, nor Catholick, for he speaks of things done, and to be done, and not for things believed, or to be believed.* 4. *A right sober Man may, without the least touch of Insolency or Madness, dispute a business of Religion with the* Roman, *either Church or Prelate, as all Men know* Irenæus *did with Victor.* Now to all this you reply, *That the Argument still holds* à minori ad majus, *and reaches to every Person that in any matter whatsoever obstinately opposes himself against the Church of God.* And is not this an excellent way of arguing from the *less to the greater*, to argue from a *Rite* or *Ceremony* observed by the Universal *Church* to a *matter of Faith* determined by the *Roman Church?* This is *à minori ad majus* with a witness. But your Reason is as good as your Answer, which is, *because there was always some point or matter of Faith involved in every Universally practised Rite or Ceremony of the Church.* I pray Sir then, Tell us what the *matter of Faith* was which lay in the Offering on *Maundy-Thursday* in the Morning, or after Supper? and by whom this *point of Faith* was determined? and how far it is obligatory? and whether it be not *sinful, heretical, and damnable*, so much as modestly to doubt of it? For all this, you told us, belongs to all matters of Faith determined by the Catholick Church. What remains of this Chapter, need not hold us long, for *A. C.*'s illation from the *Catholick Churches not erring, that therefore it cannot be lawful to separate from the* Roman *Church*, is absurd and illogical; and depends on that gross mistake, that the *Roman and Catholick Church* are all one, which we have abundantly disproved in the precedent Chapter. What follows concerning the *Catholick Churches not erring*, and how far *that extends*, concerning the *Catalogue of Fundamentals, and any Errors admitted in the Church, being destructive to its Being, because derogatory to God's Veracity*, have been so amply discussed in their proper places, that I find no Temptation from any new Arguments here suggested, to resume the debate of them. There being then nothing material, which hath not been handled already; I here conclude this Chapter.

Ibid.

p. 150, 151.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of keeping Faith with Hereticks.

The Occaſion of this Diſpute. The Reaſon why this Doctrine is not commonly defended: Yet all own ſuch Principles from whence it neceſſarily follows. The matter of Fact as to the Council of Conſtance, *and* John Huſſe *opened. Of the nature of the Safe-conduct granted him by the Emperor, that it was not a general one,* ſalvâ juſtitiâ, *but particular,* jure ſpeciali; *which is largely proved. The Particulars concerning* Hierom *of* Prague. *Of the Safe-conduct granted by the Council of* Trent. *Of the Diſtinction of Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Power, and that from thence it follows, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* Simancha, *and ſeveral others fully aſſert this Doctrine. Of the Invitation to the Council of* Trent, *and the good Inſtructions there; and of Publick Diſputation.*

A. C.'s Endeavour not only to charge *Proteſtants* with the guilt of *Schiſm,* but to juſtifie and clear the Proceedings of the *Church* of *Rome* towards them, hath led us into a new Diſpute, how far ſhe is to be truſted in the greateſt Promiſes which are made to ſuch whom ſhe accounts *Hereticks.* Which is occaſioned by theſe Words of his, *That after this Breach was made, the Church of* Rome *was ſo kind and careful to ſeek the Proteſtants, that ſhe invited them publickly with Safe-conduct to* Rome, *to a General Council, freely to ſpeak what they could for themſelves:* Or, if we take his Words, as you give them us, the Senſe is the ſame to our Purpoſe (and therefore you impertinently cavil with his Lordſhip for not keeping Faith with *A. C.*) *Which did at firſt ſeek to recal them from their Novel Opinions, and after their Breach did permit, yea invite them publickly to* Rome *to a General Council,* &c. Upon which his Lordſhip ſays: *Indeed I think the Church of* Rome *did carefully ſeek the Proteſtants; but I doubt it was to bring them within their Net. And ſhe invited them to* Rome. *A very ſafe Place, if you mark it, for them to come to, juſt as the Lion (in the Apologue) invited the Fox to his own Den. Yea, but there was Safe conduct offered too: Yes, Conduct perhaps, but not ſafe, or ſafe perhaps, for going thither, but none for coming thence.* Veſtigia nulla retrorſum. *Yea, but it ſhould have been to a General Council. Perhaps ſo. But was the Conduct ſafe, that was given to a Council which they call General, to ſome others before them? No ſure,* John Huſſe, *and* Hierom *of* Prague *burnt for all their Safe conduct. And ſo long as the Jeſuits write and maintain, That Faith given is not to be kept with Hereticks, and the Church of* Rome *leaves this lewd Doctrine uncenſured (as it hath hitherto done, and no Exception put in of Force and Violence)* A.C. *ſhall pardon us, that we come not to* Rome, *nor within the reach of* Roman *Power, what freedom of Speech ſoever he promiſed us. For to what end freedom of Speech on their part, ſince they are reſolved to alter nothing? And to what end freedom of Speech on our part, if after Speech hath been free, Life ſhall not?* This you call a *Theme, which, for the moſt part, our Adverſaries love to dwell upon, as thinking they have ſome great Advantage againſt us therein.* And, can you blame them for inſiſting much on that which their Lives are concerned in, and it will appear in the Proſecution of this Subject, that we have this great Advantage againſt you, that we are come to underſtand your Arts ſo well, as not ſo eaſily to be catched by your perfidious Subtilties. And as we underſtand your Practices better

§. 1.

P. 143. n. 7.

P. 152.

ter than to rely on your Promiſes of this Nature, ſo we are not ſo ignorant of the Intrigues of your Proceedings, as to ſuppoſe that commonly and openly you ſhould defend this Poſition, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*. For thereby you would loſe the intent and deſign of it; for none would be ſo ſilly as to venture themſelves into the Hands of ſuch, who openly profeſs, *They are not bound to keep Faith with them.* For, Do you think that Father *Fulgentio* would ever have gone to *Rome* on the Safe-conduct moſt ſolemnly given by *Paul* 5. if he had underſtood beforehand, with what Perfidiouſneſs he ſhould have been dealt with there; and all under this Pretext, that *Safe-conduct was given for his coming thither, but not for his going thence?* Is this the *Faith* of the *Apoſtolical See?* Is this the *Catholick and Roman Faith?* If ſo, the *Roman Faith*, before ever it was *Chriſtian*, was much more infallible than this; that never was acquainted with ſuch a perfidious Infallibility. Well then might his Lordſhip ſay, *The Conduct might be ſafe for his going thither, but not for his coming thence.* Veſtigia nulla retrorſum. And ſo *Fulgentio* to his Sorrow found it. We ſee therefore, it is very neceſſary for you to diſown this Principle, as much as poſſible, till you have occaſion to practiſe it, and then Woe be to them to whoſe Lot it falls to make the Experiment. Though therefore both *publickly and privately, in Word and Writing*, as you tell us, *You teach and profeſs, That Faith is to be kept as well with Hereticks, as Catholicks*, yet your Adverſaries have no great Reaſon to rely on your Promiſes, when they find your Practices apparently to the contrary, and thoſe Practices built on ſuch Principles which you all own, and contend for, and that notwithſtanding what you confidently ſay to the contrary, ſeveral of your Writers have in Terms aſſerted it. All which ſhall be made good in this Chapter. And therefore, though you ſay it, and ſay it over again, thoſe who know the Ambiguity of your Expreſſions, your many Reſervations, and Exceptions which you make, will not be very confident of the honeſty of your Meaning, by the fairneſs of your Expreſſions. Theſe are therefore *no Clamorous Accuſations*, but very ſad Truths, which the Experience of the World, and your Dealings have too often taught us; that at laſt we are forced to diſtinguiſh between a *Princes Safe-conduct*, and an *Eccleſiaſtical Trepan.* For no other will that appear to be, which was granted by Pope *Paul* to *Fulgentio*, or the Emperor, and Council of *Conſtance* to *John Huſſe*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*. If Chriſt therefore, after he had ſaid, That *they ſhould give to* Cæſar *the Things that are* Cæſars, had either denied the Payment of Tribute, or demanded it himſelf, *Becanus* might then ſay, That was a fit Parallel for you in this Controverſie, whoſe open Actions do palpably contradict you, when you ſay, *That Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.*

§. 2. For the clearing of which, we muſt firſt relate the Matter of Fact in the Caſe of the Council of *Conſtance*, and then examine the ſeveral Evaſions you make in Vindication of their Proceedings, notwithſtanding the Safe-conduct given by the Emperor and Council. The Story then is briefly this; A Council at *Conſtance* being called, for redreſſing Abuſes in the Church; and putting an end to that *Schiſm*, which was between the three Antipopes, *Gregory* 12, *Benedict* 13, *John* 23. *John Huſſe* is ſummoned by the Emperor *Sigiſmund* to appear before it. And to take away all Fears and Suſpicions of unhandſome Dealing, the Emperor grants him a Safe-conduct, in which it was expreſſed, *Omni prorſus impedimento remoto, tranſire, ſtare, morari, & redire libere permittatis*; that without all manner of Hindrance, he ſhould be ſuffered to come, appear, ſtay, and return freely. That ſuch a Safe-conduct was given by the Emperor, and pleaded by *Huſſe*, is agreed

agreed on all Sides. But notwithſtanding this, he had not been above three Weeks in *Conſtance*, but, contrary to his Safe-conduct, he is thrown into Priſon; which being done in the Emperor's Abſence, he returns to the Council, and argues the Caſe with them, upon which they paſs the Decree contained in the 19th Seſſion of that Council, in theſe Words cited in the Margin, which that you may not quarrel with my Interpretation of, I will take your own: *This preſent ſacred Synod declareth, That by whatſoever Safe-conduct, granted by the Emperor, Kings, or other ſecular Princes, to Hereticks, or ſuch as are defamed for Hereſie, no Prejudice can ariſe, no Impediment can, or ought to be put to the Catholick Faith, or other Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, but that (notwithſtanding the ſaid Safe-conduct) it may be lawful for any competent and eccleſiaſtical Judge to enquire into the Errors of ſuch Perſons, and duly otherwiſe proceed againſt them, and puniſh them ſo far as Juſtice ſhall require, if they ſhall pertinaciouſly refuſe to revoke their Errors; yea, tho' they come to the Place of Judgment, relying upon ſuch Safe-conduct, and would not otherwiſe come thither; nor doth he who ſo promiſeth, remain obliged in any thing, having done what lies in him.* Upon this Decree of the Council, the Emperor looks on himſelf, as abſolved from his Obligation, and not only concurred in the Sentence againſt *Huſſe*, but gave order himſelf about his Execution. The Queſtion then is, Whether the Emperor did not break his Faith with *John Huſſe* in ſo doing; and, Whether the Council did not decree, that neither he, nor any elſe, were bound to keep it with Hereticks. Although this Caſe be ſo plain and clear to all Perſons, who have any Senſe of Juſtice and Honeſty, that we dare appeal to the moſt indifferent Perſons in the World, Whether it be not a notorious Violation of Faith, after a moſt ſolemn Promiſe of ſafe Return, to proceed to Judgment againſt the Perſon, who came meerly relying on that Promiſe, and the ſame Perſon to be the Inſtrument of his Execution, who gave the Safe-conduct on which he truſted: And whether the declaring, that ſuch a Perſon is not obliged to keep his Promiſe, becauſe it is a Matter of Hereſie he had promiſed in, be not to declare, *That no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.* Yet ſince no Actions are ſo bad, if they tend to your Advantage, but you will have ſomething to blind the Eyes of the Simple with, we muſt conſider what you have to plead in Vindication of theſe Proceedings. You tell us then, *That the Emperor did not break his Faith with* John Huſſe, *and that notwithſtanding the Safe-conduct given, he was juſtly burnt.* Bold and daring Aſſertions! but we muſt enquire into the Reaſons of them. Two Things you ſeem moſt to rely on, and the Strength of all your Anſwer depends on them; which being the Things, *Becanus*, and the reſt of your Party inſiſt on in this Caſe, I ſhall more cloſely examine. The firſt is, *From the Nature of the Safe-conduct given, that it was not ſuch as could hinder Juſtice*; the ſecond is, *From the Difference of the ſecular and eccleſiaſtical Power, and that the Emperor could make no Promiſe in Prejudice of the Churches Juriſdiction.*

Præſens ſancta Synodus ex quovis Salvo-conductu per Imperatorem, Reges, & alios ſæculi Principes, Hæreticis vel de Hæreſi diffamatis, putantes coſdem ſic à ſuis Erroribus revocare, quocunque ſe vinculo obſtrinxerint, conceſſo, nullum Fidei Catholicæ vel Juriſdictioni Eccleſiaſticæ Præjudicium generari, vel Impedimentum præſtari poſſe, ſeu debere declarat, quo minus dicto Salvo-conductu non obſtante, liceat judici competenti & eccleſiaſtico, de hujuſmodi Perſonarum Erroribus inquirere, & alias contra eos debitè procedere, eoſdemque punire, quantum Juſtitia ſuadebit, ſi ſuos Errores revocare pertinaciter recuſaverint; etiamſi de Salvo-conductu confiſi ad Locum venerint Judicii alias non venturi; nec ſic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipſo eſt, ex aliquo remanſiſſe obligatum. Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ. 19. P. 1075. Tom. 7. Concil. P. 2. Ed. Binii.

First, You diſtinguiſh of a Safe-conduct, *which*, you ſay, *may be granted two Ways; firſt*, Jure communi, *when 'tis given only againſt unjuſt Violence*, ſalvâ ſemper Juſtitiâ, *provided always that Juſtice be not impeached: Secondly*, Jure ſpeciali, *when it ſecures a Man againſt all Violence whatſoever, whether juſt or unjuſt, and chiefly in that Cauſe for which it was given. In the former*

P. 153. N. 2.

P. 3.

Ibid.

former Manner only, you ſay, *a Safe-conduct was granted by the Emperor to* John Huſſe, *and by the Council of* Conſtance *to* Hierom *of* Prague: *In the latter Sort, the Council of* Trent *offered Safe-conduct to the Proteſtants in* Germany, &c. *No Faith therefore was broken with* John Huſſe; *for, a Safe-conduct was only given him* Jure communi, *by which Juſtice was to remain un-impeachable, ſince he was only promiſed to be defended againſt unjuſt Violence; which was performed.* I grant, a Safe-conduct may be given two Ways; the firſt is to ſecure Men from all unjuſt Violence, in order to a legal Tryal; and this is granted in ſuch Caſes, when the Perſon accuſed looks on the Law as open for him as well as his Adverſaries, and puts himſelf on a fair Tryal before equal and indifferent Judges: And in ſuch Caſes the Intent of the Safe-conduct is expreſſed, *Damus tibi Fidem publicam Cauſam dicendi in Judicio contra Vim, non contra Juris executionem*; as the *Formula* of it is in the *Roman* Empire; thence that Imperial Conſtitution which prohibits that any Safe-conduct be given to the Accuſer, or the guilty Perſon, *adverſus publicum Judicium, ſed ſolum contra Vim*, againſt publick Juſtice, but only againſt Violence: But then theſe are the Safe-conducts which ſubordinate Officers can only grant; becauſe theſe have no Power over the Life of Perſons, but they are only to ſee Juſtice duly adminiſtred to all Perſons, in order to which they may give ſuch Safe-conducts as may prevent ſuch Things as may hinder the due Execution of Juſtice. But then further, a Safe-conduct may be given with reſpect to thoſe who are to judge of the Cauſe, *i. e.* in caſe a Perſon avoids Appearance, upon Fears that the Perſons he is ſummoned before, will preſently caſt him into Priſon, or put him to Death; now, if a Safe-conduct be granted by him, who hath the abſolute Power of Life and Liberty, ſo as to hinder the Execution of any Sentence paſſed, in this Caſe the Safe-conduct is full and abſolute, and admits of no Reſtrictions or Limitations. Now this latter is plainly our preſent Caſe; For *John Huſſe* had been ſummoned before to appear at *Rome*, to vindicate himſelf in Point of *Hereſie*, but ſuſpecting foul Dealing, he durſt not go: And, Can we in Reaſon think he would ever have gone to *Conſtance*, if the Emperor had not granted him ſuch a Conduct as might ſecure him from his Fears, as to his Life and Liberty? And therefore, ſince the Emperor, to whom it only belonged to diſpoſe of both, had granted him ſo expreſs a Safe-conduct, he thought he might ſecurely go. For, To what End or Purpoſe is a Safe-conduct granted, if it be not to ſecure that which the Perſon to whom it was given, had moſt Cauſe to fear? Now it is apparent, *John Huſſe* was not afraid of any unjuſt Violence by the Way, for he was ſo ſecure as to that, that he left his Safe-conduct in the Hands of his Friends, 'till he came at *Conſtance*, as appears by the unqueſtionable Reports of that Story on all Hands; which is an evident Argument, that the Intent of the Safe-conduct was to ſecure him at *Conſtance*, from any Injury being done him by the Council. And although the Council might take upon them, not only to judge of *Hereſie*, but to condemn him for it; yet as long as the Execution of that Sentence belonged to the ſecular Power, he had Reaſon to think, that whatever the Council might determine, yet the Emperor's Faith being ſolemnly given him, he need not fear the Execution of it. For that being in the Emperor's Power, he was bound by his publick Faith not to give way to it. To make this clear by an Inſtance; It is more evident by our Laws, that one who hath taken Orders at *Rome*, coming into the Nation, and being convicted of it, is liable to Death, than it was by the Laws then in Force, that ſuch who were condemned for *Hereſie*, ſhould be burnt; Suppoſe now, That a Prieſt be ſummoned by the King to appear before his Courts of Juſtice, with

with a Safe conduct, or Promiſe given, that he ſhould come, appear, and return freely, without any Hindrance; Would not you, or any other *Romiſh Prieſt*, think your ſelves hardly dealt with, and that the King had broken his Faith, if he ſhould not only ſuffer you to be Condemned, but give expreſs Order for your Execution; and then tell you, that the Safe-conduct was to be underſtood *Salvâ Juſtitiâ*, without any Impeachment of *Juſtice*, and that it was only to protect you from all unjuſt Violence? And, Was not the Caſe juſt the ſame here of the Emperor *Sigiſmund*, and *John Huſſe*? Was *John Huſſe* ſo ignorant, as not to know they would condemn him for Hereſie, when a Council at *Rome*, had condemned him for it already? Or, Did not he know what Courſe was like to be taken with Perſons ſo condemned? What could he then imagine to be the Intent of this Safe-conduct, but to ſecure him from all Violence to be done to his Perſon, under a Pretence of Execution of Juſtice? And for all this, was not the Emperor's Faith violated, when he was not only impriſoned, but burnt, by the Emperor's expreſs Order, notwithſtanding his ſolemn Promiſe, that he ſhould come, appear, and return freely, without any Hinderance? If this be a Safe-conduct, it is only ſuch a one as they that go to the Gallows have, a Safe-conduct to Execution. Beſides, that this could not be ſuch a Safe conduct, *Salvâ Juſtitiâ*, as you ſpeak of, is manifeſt from the Tenour and Words of it. For Safe-conducts, being granted in Favour of Perſons, are to be taken in their largeſt Senſe, if no Limitations be expreſſed in them; and it is a Rule among thoſe who ſhould, and do underſtand theſe Things beſt, *That a Safe conduct is of the Nature of a Covenant, and the Words of it import a Promiſe, and therefore, if they be general, are extended as far as the Words will bear. And that all the Doctors do unanimouſly concur, that a general Safe-conduct of coming to a Judge, or appearing in a Court of Judicature, do import a freedom of Departure, and going thence.* So that we ſee, if we take the Emperor's Safe-Conduct in the expreſs Words of it, it imports much more than ſuch a one as is only *Salvâ Juſtitiâ*; becauſe it ran in the moſt general and comprehenſive Terms, and was granted not by any ſubordinate Judge, but by the Emperor himſelf, who was able, as well as bound, to make it good in the moſt large and extenſive Senſe. But further, if this had been granted only *Salvâ Juſtitiâ*, ſo that the Council had Liberty to proceed on him as they ſaw good, What made the Emperor take their Impriſonment of him ſo ill, as *Nauclerus* and others report he did, and that becauſe of the Safe-conduct he had given him? It ſeems the Emperor wanted *Becanus*, and you, to have told him, That he never granted any Safe-conduct, but what had the Reſervation of a *Salvâ Juſtitiâ*, and that ſuch Juſtice too, as his greateſt Enemy muſt ſhew him: If he had known this, he needed not have been troubled at that which he made account of, in granting the Safe-conduct. Laſtly, What need the Council have taken ſuch Pains to ſatisfie the Emperor, by declaring in a Decree, that neither he, nor any Prince was bound by their Safe-conducts, to hinder Hereticks from being puniſhed, if he had not thought himſelf obliged to do it, by the Safe-conduct he had given? And if he did think ſo before the Decree of the Council, then certainly there was no *Salvâ Juſtitiâ* underſtood by him in the Safe-conduct he had granted. Thus we ſee, how on all Hands it appears, from *Huſſe*'s Fears and Deſires, the Emperor's Power, the Nature of Safe-Conducts, the Emperor's own Senſe of it, and the Council's Decree, That this firſt Anſwer hath no ground at all, *viz.* that the Safe-conduct was granted

Verba Salvi-conductus ſunt Verba fidei datæ, & ſapiunt Naturam pacti: quare, ſi generalia ſint, extenduntur quatenus verba patiuntur. Omnes Doctores uno ore aſſerunt, Generalem promiſſionem Securitatis veniendi ad Judicem ſeu comparendi in Judicio, etiam Libertatem recedendi abeundiq; complecti. Pet. Premus de Securit. Quæſt. 6. p. 33, 36.

ed *jure communi*, and that it was only to hinder unjuſt Violence, and not the execution of Juſtice.

But beſides, you ſay, *John Huſſe* was juſtly burnt, for two reaſons: *The firſt is, For being obſtinate in his Hereſie; the ſecond, For having fled, which the Emperor had prohibited in his ſafe-conduct, under pain of Death.* I anſwer, It is not, Whether a Man, obſtinate in Hereſie, may be burnt, which is now the Queſtion, although that may juſtly bear a Diſpute too: But, Whether one, ſuſpected for Hereſie, and coming to a Council with ſafe-conduct for coming and returning, may be burnt without Violation of Faith; your firſt reaſon then, is nothing to the Purpoſe, and your ſecond as little: Firſt, Becauſe there is no certain Evidence at all of *Huſſe*'s flying; it not being objected againſt him by the Emperor, who only upbraided him with his Obſtinacy in his Hereſie, as the cauſe of his Execution; and withal, if *Huſſe* had fled, and had ſuffered Death for that, as you ſay he ought to have done, he would not have ſuffered the Death proper to Hereſie, but to flying; nor been accounted (as by all your own Authors he is) a ſufferer on the account of Hereſie. But this being a groundleſs Calumny, it needs no further Confutation.

§. 4. But before we come to your ſecond Anſwer, the caſe of *Hierom* of *Prague* muſt be diſcuſſed ſo far as it is diſtinct from that of *John Huſſe*; who, it ſeems, was trepanned by a pretended Safe-conduct granted him by the Council, and not by the Emperor, *wherein*, you tell us, *that expreſs Clauſe of* ſalva ſemper juſtitia *was inſerted* (which is another Argument that the Safe-conduct of the Emperor to *Huſſe* was of another Nature, becauſe it ran in general Terms, without any ſuch Clauſe) but poor *Hierom*, who, it ſeems, was not acquainted with the Arts and Subtilties of his Enemies, but thought them as honeſt as himſelf, ventures to *Conſtance* upon this Safe-conduct: but when he came thither, and began to underſtand the Jugglings of his Enemies, he thought to ſhift for himſelf by Flight, but being taken, was burnt. So that *Hierom* ſuffered through his honeſt Simplicity and Credulity, not conſidering what that *ſalvâ juſtitiâ* would mean in his Caſe, which, as they interpreted it, was ſuch another Safe-conduct, as known Malefactors have to the place of Juſtice: but to call it a Safe-conduct, in the Senſe which *Hierom* apprehended it in, is as proper as to ſay, A Man that is to be executed ſhall have a *Salvo* for his Life. This was therefore intended, as appears by the Event, as a meer Trick to bring him within their Power; and ſo all ſuch Safe-conducts granted with thoſe Clauſes (by ſuch Perſons who are to interpret them themſelves) are, and nothing elſe: For they are the ſole Judges what this Juſtice ſhall be. Neither can you ſay then, That Faith was kept with *Hierom* of *Prague*: for no ſuch thing as a Safe-conduct, truly ſo called, was intended him; and when the Emperor was ſollicited to grant him one, he utterly denied it, becauſe of the bad Succeſs he had in that of *John Huſſe*; and ſome of the Council being then preſent with the Emperor, offered to give him a Safe-conduct, but they very honeſtly explained themſelves, that it was a Safe-conduct for coming thither, but not for going thence again. And ſo it proved. So that Faith was well *given* to *Hierom* of *Prague*, and as well kept to *John Huſſe*.

But, ſay you, *Had the Proteſtants gone to the Council of* Trent, *upon the ſafe-conduct granted them by that Council* jure ſpeciali, *in the ſecond manner, they could not at all have been puniſhed under any pretence of Hereſie, without manifeſt breach of Faith; which all Catholicks hold to be unlawful. The like may be ſaid of the Safe conduct offered them for going to* Rome. But you muſt better ſatisfie us, that you look upon this as a breach of Faith, than as yet

yet you have done. For ſo many are your Ambiguities, in your Expreſſions of this Nature, that Men who know your Arts, can hardly tell when they have your right Meaning. For you may look on all Breach of Faith as unlawful, and yet not look on your acting contrary to your expreſs Words, in Safe-conducts offered to Hereticks, to be a Breach of Faith. For you may ſay, Faith is there only broken, where Men are bound to keep it; but you are not bound to keep it with Hereticks, and that becauſe your Obligation to the Church is greater than it can be to Hereticks: when therefore you have Hereticks in your Power, it is an eaſie Matter for you to ſay, that, were it in any thing elſe, but in a Matter ſo nearly concerning the Intereſt of your *Holy Mother* the *Church*, you could not but obſerve it, but your Obligation to that is ſo great, as deſtroys all other which are contrary to it; and the Obligation being deſtroyed, there is no Breach of Faith at all; and therefore you may hold all Breach of Faith unlawful, and yet you may proceed againſt thoſe whom you account Hereticks, contrary to all Engagements whatſoever, and then ſay, This is no Breach of Faith. And the Truth is, by your Doctrines of Equivocations, and mental Reſervations, you have made all manner of converſe in the World ſo lubricous and uncertain, that he who hath to deal with you, eſpecially in Matters where the Intereſt of your Church is concerned, had need be wary, and *remember to diſtruſt*, or elſe he may repent it afterwards. If you therefore account the *Proteſtants crafty Foxes, in not coming to* Rome, *or the Council of* Trent, it was, becauſe they would not venture too near the *Lion's Den*; but if you will not account them wiſe Men, for refuſing ſo fair an Offer, you will give us leave to think them ſo, till they ſee better Reaſon to truſt your Offers. And the Council of *Trent* did very well to tell them in their Form of Safe-conduct, they would not do by them as the Council of *Conſtance* did, for therein they ſhew, how much the Faith of Councils was ſunk by that, ſo that if that were not particularly excepted, no truſt would ever be given to them more. But, ſuppoſing the Safe-conduct of the Council of *Trent* to have been never ſo free from Suſpicion, the Proteſtants had ſufficient Reaſons not to appear there, as will be manifeſted afterwards.

We come therefore now to your ſecond Anſwer, in Vindication of the Council of *Conſtance*, which is this, *That by that Decree the Council declares, that no Secular Power, how ſovereign ſoever, can hinder the Proceedings of the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal in Cauſes of Hereſie; for which there is great Reaſon; and conſequently, if the Emperor, or any other Secular Prince, grants a Safe-conduct. or makes Promiſe of any thing to the Prejudice of that Juriſdiction, it ſhall not hold. The Reaſon is, becauſe 'tis a Promiſe made of a thing not pertaining to the Juriſdiction of that Prince, nor wholly in his Power to ſee performed.* To this I anſwer, 1. That if I underſtand any thing, this is expreſly to ſay, That no *Prince is to keep Faith with Hereticks*, and that is it which you are charged with; and you made uſe of this Diſtinction to free your ſelves from. Now that this is the plain meaning of it, thus appears; you ſay in the Words immediately after; *But the Council no where teaches, That Faith or Safe-conduct given in temporal Cauſes properly pertaining to the Princes Juriſdiction, is not to be kept by all, and to all Perſons of what Condition ſoever, ſo far as it is poſſible.* Which is as much as to ſay, That in any other Caſe but that of Hereſie, they are to keep Faith, but not in that: for this of Hereſie, is that which you oppoſe to all Temporal Cauſes, and challenge it as belonging to an Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal; when therefore the Council of *Conſtance* decrees, That no Secular Power is obliged by any Safe-conduct, to any thing which may hinder the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunals proceeding in cauſes of Hereſie, what doth it elſe but declare

§. 5. P. 154.

declare in expreſs Terms, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, i. e.* in any thing relating to their Hereſie; for this, you ſay, they have nothing to do with: and therefore let Kings and Princes make never ſo ſolemn Promiſes and Engagements to Men ſuſpected of Hereſie, to their Peril be it, who rely upon them, for they have nothing to do to promiſe in ſuch Matters, and though their Faith be given never ſo publickly and ſolemnly, they are not bound to keep it; nay, they are bound not to keep it: for, if they ſhould, it would be to the apparent Miſchief and Prejudice of the Church. This neceſſarily follows from your own Words, and the Diſtinction here uſed by you. So that now we need ſeek no further than your ſelf, and *Becanus*, for the open avowing of this Principle, That *no Prince is bound to keep Faith with Hereticks*; but if he doth promiſe Safe-conduct to them though it be more than he can do, yet the Church can make that good uſe of it, that by that Means ſhe may get the Hereticks under her Power; and when ſhe hath them, it is but then declaring this Promiſe to be null, and ſhe may do with them as ſhe pleaſes. Neither is it only *Becanus*, and you, who ſay this, but it is the received Principle among you, whatever you ſay or pretend to the contrary; I mean not, that you ſay in expreſs Terms, That *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*, but by this Diſtinction of the Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Power, as you uſe it, you ſay that from whence it neceſſarily follows. But yet I anſwer 2. Though this Diſtinction ſhould be granted, yet it cannot really excuſe the Emperor from violating his Faith. For, I ſay, he promiſed nothing but what was in his Power, which was, to ſecure him as to Life and Liberty. Now, although the Emperor had ſuffered the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal, to do what belonged to it, which was to enquire into the Charge of Hereſie, and to give Sentence upon the Perſon, yet the Execution belonged wholly to the Secular Power; as the Council it ſelf acknowledged, when after the Sentence of Hereſie was pronounced againſt *J. Huſſe*, there was nothing of the executive part which was pleaded, as belonging to the Church, but only Degradation, and that was performed in the Preſence of the Council; upon which the *Sacred Synod declares, That they had no more to do with him, but to deliver him over to the Secular Power, and accordingly decrees it to be done.* Now when the Synod declares this, Is it not plain, that what concerns his Life, doth properly and only belong to the Secular Power? If therefore the Emperor was bound to do all which lay in him to do, he was effectually bound to ſecure him as to Life and Liberty, for both thoſe lay within his Power. And therefore, when he gave Order for his Execution, he was highly guilty of the Violation of his Faith; and if the Council of *Conſtance* declared him abſolved as to this too, it is yet more evident, that they not only decreed, That *no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks* in Matters concerning the Eccleſiaſtical Tribunal, but in ſuch as concerned the Secular Power, which is as much as to ſay, Not at all. And by this the Vanity of this Diſtinction of the Secular and Eccleſiaſtical Power is ſufficiently manifeſt, and that it evidently appears, that the Council of *Conſtance* did decree, That *no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks.* And thus I have proved, that his Lordſhip hath not, as you calumniate him, *ignorantly or maliciouſly wronged the Council*, but that no other tolerable Senſe, beſides that which his Lordſhip ſaith, can be made of the Decree then paſſed; and notwithſtanding your Arts and Diſtinctions, nothing can be more plain, than that *John Huſſe* was trepanned into his Ruin by the Faith of the Emperor given to him. It can be therefore nothing but either palpable ignorance, or a Deceit as groſs as truſting your Safe-conduct in a matter of Hereſie, for you ſo confidently to aſſert, *That*

Hæc Sancta Synodus Conſtantienſis Johannem Hus, attento quod Eccleſia Dei non habeat ultra quod gerere valeat, judicio ſeculari relinquere, & ipſum curiæ ſeculari relinquendum fore decernit. Concil. Conſtant. ſeſſ. 15. p. 1056.

if

if the Relator had not mangled the Words of the Council (to deceive his Reader) but set down the decree fairly and fully as it is, the busines had been so clear, that it would scarce have any dispute. Whereas his Lordship only sets down the title of the Decree, and so he tells you himself, and this he doth as faithfully as may be, and whereas nothing can more evidence the *juglings* of the *Council*, than the *Decree* it self doth, in which nothing is more plain than that, In case of *Heresie*, no *Prince* is bound to keep Faith with any Persons whatsoever.

§. 6. From the *Council* of *Constance*, we proceed to other Authors, to see, whether they do not concur with it in this Opinion. For this, his Lordship cites *Simancha* a *Spanish Bishop*, and a *Canonist* as well as *Civilian*, who expresly saith, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, as neither with Tyrants, Pirates, or other publick Robbers*; and plainly justifies the Proceedings of the *Council of Constance* in that respect, in that *Hereticks by their solemn Judgment were burnt, although publick security had been given them.* Let us now see, what answer you return to these clear Citations. In general you say, *The Bishop was insincere or unadvised in quoting this Author.* I wonder wherein: I am sure, not so much as you are in your Answers to him. For, you say, *Simancha holds not this absolutely and universally, but only in cases, wherein that which is promised cannot be lawfully performed. Hence, say you,* Simancha *hath these Words,* Veruntamen (ut Marius Salomonius ait) promissa contra Christum fides, si præstetur, perfidia est, *If Faith be given against Christ, that is, to the dishonour of God, or contrary to the Precepts of true Religion, it were perfidiousnes to observe it.* But the Answer to this is easie: For it appears from *Simancha*'s own Grounds, that he supposeth it holds universally, because Faith can never be given to Hereticks, so as that Promise can be lawfully performed, because thereby he supposeth it given against *Christ*, and to the dishonour of *God*, and therefore concludes, it would be Perfidiousnes to observe it. And this is evident from *Simancha*'s own Grounds, which he gives for it. *For*, saith he, *if Faith be not to be kept with Tyrants, Pirates, and other Robbers, which kill the Body; much less with Hereticks who destroy Souls:* which reason being absolute and universal, his Proposition must be so too. And very consonantly to his former Assertions concludes, *That if Faith be given them with an Oath, against the publick good, against the Salvation of Souls, against divine and humane Laws, it is not to be kept*; and it is well known that all *Heresies* are accounted so by you, and therefore in no Case *Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.* Neither can this possibly be understood meerly of private Persons; for his Words are general, and we see he vindicates the Proceedings of the *Council* at *Constance* upon these Grounds, and he quotes *Marius Salomonius* and *Placa*, who likewise assert in terms, That *Faith* given to *Hereticks* is not to be kept, and makes use of the Instance of the *Council* of *Constance* to prove it. And *Menochius*, whom *Simancha* likewise cites, who was an *Italian Canonist*, and therefore might well know the Practices of *Rome* in these Cases, saith, *That* Placa *expresly holds, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, which*, he saith, *he understands so, when Faith is given to the Injury of the Catholick Faith*: and cites *Conradus Brunus* to this purpose, *That it is not lawful to make such Agreements with Here-*

P. 155.

Fides Hæreticis data servanda non est, sicut nec Tyrannis, Piratis, & cæteris publicis prædonibus. Simancha Instit. Cathol. tit. 45. sect. 51.

Jure igitur Hæretici quidam gravissimo Concilii Constantiensis judicio, legitimâ flammâ concremati sunt, quamvis promissa illis securitas fuisset. Instit. tit. 46. sect. 52.

Si Tyrannis, Piratis, & cæteris prædonibus fides servanda non est, qui corpus occidunt; longe minus hæreticis pertinacibus, qui occidunt animas. Id. ib.

Quamobrem fides illis data, etiam juramento *firmata, contra publicum bonum, contra salutem animarum, contra jura divina & humana, nullo modo servanda.* Ib.

Scribit etiam Salomonius in d. l. 2. exact. de orig juris, & refert Petrus Placa l. 1. epit. delict. c. 37. in fin. *Ita observatum fuisse contra hæreticos vocatos in Concilio Constantiensi sub salvo-conductu, qui tamen contra datam fidem necati fuerunt. Non ergo salvo-conductui fidere debuit.* D. Scipio. Menochius, lib. 1. Concil. 100. n. 191.

Quod verò scribit Placa d. c. 37. in fin. *hæretivis datam fidem servandam non esse, intelligo cum data fides est ad detrimentum fidei Catholicæ.* Id. Concil. 100. n. 219.

Ita enim loquitur Conradus Brunus in tract. de hæret. c. 14. l. 3. *cum scribit, Non licere pacisci cum hæreticis, ut liberè possint in damnata eorum secta vivere.* n. 220.

ticks,

Quod si objiciatur, Concilium Constantiense non observasse Salvos-conductos concessos ab Imperatoribus & Regibus; facile erit respondere, Non licuisse illis Imperatoribus & Regibus, concedere tutos reddere hæreticos; tum quia inferior non potest Salvum-conductum concedere damnato a majori, tum etiam quia Imperatorum & Regum est hæreticos expugnare, non autem securos & tutos reddere; quemadmodum abunde tradit Conrad. Brunus, l. 3. *de hæret.* c. 15. *Rectè à Concilio Salvi conductus illi annullati fuerunt.* n. 227, 228.

ticks, that they may enjoy the Liberty of their own Sect. If therefore they must interpret, how far the Faith given tends to the Prejudice of the Catholick Faith, we see, how little Security can be had from any solemn Promise. And *Menochius* himself *asserts the Safe conduct granted by Princes, in case of Heresie, to be unlawful, because the inferiour* (as he supposes *Princes to be to the Ecclesiastical Tribunal) cannot secure them who are condemned by the Superior, and because Kings and Emperors ought rather to destroy Hereticks, than to secure them. And therefore the Council of* Constance *did well in nulling the Safe-conducts granted to Hereticks.* And what now is this, but in plain Terms to assert, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks? Neither can you say, as some do, That they are the Canonists, and not the Church of *Rome*, which assert this: for, besides that the Canonists understand well enough the Intrigues and Proceedings of the Court of *Rome*, although it seems they do not conceal them so much as they should do, yet they are not only these who have asserted it, but some great Men of your Church have, upon Occasion, expresly said it; for we are not to expect that this should be avowed as a publick Opinion of your Church, for that were to make it unserviceable to you; but when you have those whom you call Hereticks at an Advantage, then is the time to discover this. So there wanted not some to perswade *Charles the Fifth*, notwithstanding the Safe-conduct given to *Luther* at his coming to *Worms*, to deal by him as the Council of *Constance* had done by *John Husse*, and that upon this very Account, That no Faith was to be kept with Hereticks: But the Emperor, and the Princes about him, were Persons of too great Honour and Honesty to hearken to such perfidious Counsels. And no meaner a Person than Cardinal *Hosius*, admonishes Henry, *King of* Poland, *that he ought not to keep the Faith he had given to the Protestants, and gives this Reason for it, That an Oath ought not to be the Bond of Iniquity.* And the Jesuit *Possevin* is reported to have given the same Counsel afterwards to *Stephen* King of *Poland.* But these things are, as much as possible, kept from our view, and the Books containing such Doctrines in them, are like the *Golden Legends* bought up by themselves to prevent our Discovery of their Frauds and Imposture; and therefore, if we cannot instance in those Jesuits, who have expresly taught this Opinion in Print, yet that only argues the greater Fraud and Subtilty of them, who will own and practise such Things, which they dare not publickly avow to the World. And yet it appears from the way used by *Becanus*, and you, in Vindication of your selves, that you cannot possibly avoid the asserting such things, from whence it necessarily follows, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* But because the Doctrine it self is grown a matter so odious to the World, being contrary to all Principles of Humanity and Justice, and which, if practised by all those who call each other Hereticks, would overthrow all civil Societies; therefore you dare not but in Terms disown it, though it still remains among those *Arcana Societatis*, those hidden Works of Darkness, which want only a fair Opportunity to discover themselves. But as much as you wipe your Mouth, though it be foul enough in saying, That neither the Bishop, nor all his Gang, are able to name one of them of that Opinion, to make it appear, how much you have abused your self in these Words; I shall make a short Business of it, and name your self for *one*, and *Becanus* your Author for *another*, and refer the Reader to what goes before, for

Nunquam patiaris ullâ te ratione ad ea quæ promisisti præstanda teneri; quia Jusjurandum non debet esse vinculum iniquitatis. Hosius Cardinal. Epist. 193, 202, 220.

for an Evidence that you own thoſe Principles from whence it unavoidably follows, That no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks.

But, Are the Jeſuits indeed grown ſuch honeſt Men, that not one of their Number can be named, who aſſert this Doctrine? A happy Change! For ſure they were not always ſo; if we believe that excellent Perſon of as great Integrity as Learning, and a Romaniſt too, *Jac. Auguſtus Thuanus*, in his Elegy in *Parricidas*, wherewith he concludes his Sacred Poems, in which he ſpeaks great and ſad Truths of that honeſt Society, where he mentions thoſe Cruelties and Aſſaſſinations, which were brought into theſe Parts of the World by the Arts and Opinions of a famous Society, which makes nothing of Laws, Faith, Honeſty, Religion, to advance that Intereſt which it hath eſpouſed; and expreſly ſaith, That they deny Faith to be kept, that by their Diſtinctions and Subtilties, they enervate the Force of divine Commands, they deny Obedience to Authority, deſtroy Religion, under a Pretence of Piety, break Engagements, teach the murthering *Kings*; and what not? And yet all this while, not one of all this Society ever taught, That Faith was not to be kept with Hereticks. But whence came then the great Diſputes, Whether an Oath of Allegiance might be taken to Heretical Princes? Was it not from hence that Hereſie was ſuppoſed to diſſolve that Obligation to Obedience, which otherwiſe Men lay under? And if it doth deſtroy that Faith which Men owe to their Sovereigns, in caſe of Hereſie; Will it not equally deſtroy that Faith which Princes promiſe to their Subjects in caſe of Hereſie too? For what Reaſon can be given for the one, which will not hold for the other alſo. And who were they, I pray, but thoſe Loyal Perſons the Jeſuits, who broached, fomented, and propagated that Doctrine? Was not Father *Creſwell* a Jeſuit, who under the Name of *Andreas Philopater*, delivers this excellent Doctrine, *That the whole School of Divines teach, and it is a thing certain, and of Faith, that any Chriſtian Prince, if he manifeſtly falls off from the Religion of the Catholick* Roman *Church, and endeavours to draw others from it, doth by Law of God and Man, fall from all Power and Authority; and that before the Sentence of the Pope and Judge delivered againſt him; and that all his Subjects are free from the Obligation of any Oath to him, of Obedience and Loyalty, and that they may and ought to caſt ſuch a one out of his Power, as an Apoſtate and a Heretick, leſt he infect others.* I might mention many more, who write after the ſame Nature, but I ſpare you, only this one may ſerve inſtead of many; for he delivers it not only as his own Judgment, but the conſent of the School, and as a thing moſt certain, as being of Faith: And will you ſtill ſay, That no Jeſuits own ſuch Principles, as, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks?* For if Hereſie doth thus deſtroy all Obligation to Obedience in Subjects to Heretical Princes, Will it not much more in Princes toward heretical Subjects? Becauſe certainly Princes have a greater Power and Right to command over Subjects, than Subjects over them, even in your own caſe of Hereſie. Since this therefore is the avowed Doctrine of the Jeſuitical School, perſwade whom you can to believe, that you look on an Obligation to Faith remaining in a caſe of Hereſie? Certainly, none who un-

§. 7.

Scilicet has artes nuper gens gnara nocendi
Exitio invexit, Gallia, nata tuo.
Heſperiæ fuſcis gens emiſſaria ab oris
Fucum affectatâ quæ gravitate tegit,
Nata Magiſtratum convellere, nata Miniſtris
Subſtrahere obſequium, Præſulibuſq; ſuum:
Geryonæ quæ dum placeat, favcatq; trifauci,
Terrarum reliquos non facit aſſis heros.
Et cælo facinus dignum putat, omnia ſævi
In Regis longas tradere ſceptra manus.
Quæ diſciplinam morum, quæ Gallica venit,
Exuto, legum ſolvere jura, metu,
Et vilcis regnantem animas, ipſoq; necandos
Horrendâ Reges proditione docet;
Servandamq; fidem negat, *argutiſq; cavillis*
Detorquet magni juſſa ſevera Dei.
Nos patimur ſegnes, lentiq; ſedemus ad iram,
Et pietas ipſâ religione perit.
Protinus Induciæ violantur patre Quiritum
Auctore, & Martis nuncius urbe venit.
Nos juvat antiquo vitam producere ritu,
Nos juvat in priſcâ ſimplicitate mori.
Jac. Aug. Thuan. Eleg. in Parricidas.

Univerſa Theologorum Schola tenet, & eſt certum ac de fide; Quemcunque principem Chriſtianum, ſi à Catholicâ Romanâ Religione manifeſtè deflexerit, & alios avocare voluerit, excidere ſtatim omni poteſtate, & Dignitate ex ipſâ vi Juris Divini & Humani: hocque & ante ſententiam Pontificis & Judicis contra ipſum prolatam; & ſubditos quoſcunque liberos eſſe ab omni Juramenti Obligatione, quod de Obedientiâ præſtitiſſent, poſſeque & debere hujuſmodi hominem tanquam Apoſtatam & hæreticum ex dominatu ejicere, nè alios inficiat. Andreas Philopater Reſp. ad Edict. Regin. Angl. p. 149. n. 157.

understand your Principles and Practices, will have much cause to rely on your Faith in this Particular. So much at present of the Jesuits Integrity, as to his Principle of *keeping Faith with Hereticks.* What you add further
P. 156. about the Council of *Constance*, and *John Husse*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, is only serving up the very same Matter, in somewhat different Words; for there is nothing contained in them, but what hath been sufficiently disproved already: for it all depends on the nature of the Safe-conduct, and the difference of the Secular and Ecclesiastical Power.

P. 8. His Lordship very pertinently asks, *Supposing Men might go safely to* Rome, *To what Purpose is it to go to a General Council thither, and use Freedom of Speech, since the Church of* Rome *is resolved to alter nothing*; and you very pertinently answer, *That they were invited thither to be better instructed, and*
P. 157. *reclaimed from their Errors.* But, Will no Place serve to reclaim them but *Rome?* Can they not be as well instructed elsewhere, and by other Means, than by being summoned to a *General Council?* We had thought the Intention of *General Councils* had been to have had free Debates concerning the Matters which divide the Church. But, it seems the Protestants must have been summoned as guilty Persons, *i. e.* Hereticks, and their Adversaries must have sate as their proper Judges, and such who were accused as the great Innovators, must have believed themselves Infallible, and by your own Saying, *If an Angel from Heaven had come as a Protestant thither*, he would not have been believed; nay, it had been well he had escaped so, if your Power were as great over Spirits, as over our grosser Bodies. So I suppose *John Husse*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* were invited to *Constance* to *be better instructed*; and it is well we know by their Example, what you mean by *your good Instructions*, and out of a desire to avoid them, care not how little we appear, where our Adversaries not only intend to be Judges, but resolve beforehand to condemn us whatsoever we say: For so you tell us, *That* Rome, *and the Fathers of* Trent *were resolved to stick to their own Doctrine* (which they call *Catholick*) *notwithstanding any pretended Difficulties or Objections brought against it, either by Bishops, or any other Person.* Your kind Invitations then of the Protestants, were wonderful Expressions of your Churches Civility towards them; that they might be present to hear themselves condemned, and then escape how they could themselves.

The offer of a publick Disputation, his Lordship truly tells you, *signifies nothing, without an indifferent Arbitration, and the Impossibility of agreeing on that, renders the other useless*; and only becomes such Thrasonical Persons as *Campian* was, who yet had as little Reason as any Man to boast of his Atchievements in his Disputations. When you therefore say, *His Lordship would have some Atheist, Turk or Jew, to sit as indifferent Persons*; you shew only your Scurrility, and want of Understanding. For his Lordship only insists on the Necessity of that, to shew the uselesness of publick Disputations, where such cannot be agreed on, as in this case. And he truly saith, *This is a good Answer to all such Offers; that the Kings and Church of* England *had no Reason to admit of a publick Dispute with the English Romish Clergy, till they shall be able to shew it under the Seal or Powers of* Rome, *that that Church will submit to a Third, who may be an indifferent Judge between us and them; or to such a General Council as is after mentioned* (not such a one as you would have, wherein the *Pope should sit as Head of the Church*, for that is to
P. 185. make the greatest Criminal, Judge in his own Cause.) *And this*, saith he, *is an honest, and, I think, a full Answer. And without this, all Disputation must end in Clamour; and therefore the more Publick, the worse. Because, as the Clamour is the greater, so perhaps will be the Schism too.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Reformation of the Church of *England* juſtified.

The Church of Rome *guilty of Schiſm, by unjuſtly caſting Proteſtants out of Communion. The Communion of the Catholick and particular Churches diſtinguiſhed. No Separation of Proteſtants from the Catholick Church. The Devotions of the Church of* England *and* Rome *compared. Particular Churches Power to reform themſelves in caſe of general Corruption, proved. The Inſtance from the Church of* Judah *vindicated. The Church of* Rome *paralleld with the Ten Tribes. General Corruptions make Reformation the more neceſſary. Whether thoſe things we condemn as Errors, were Catholick Tenets at the Time of the Reformation. The contrary ſhewed, and the difference of the Church of* Rome *before and ſince the Reformation. When things may be ſaid to be received as Catholick Doctrines. How far particular Churches Power to reform themſelves extends. His Lordſhip's Inſtances for the Power of Provincial Councils in Matters of Reformation vindicated. The particular Caſe of the Church of* England *diſcuſſed. The Proceedings in our Reformation defended. The Church of* England *a true Church. The National Synod* 1562. *a lawful Synod. The Biſhops no Intruders in Queen* Elizabeth's *Time. The Juſtice and Moderation of the Church of* England *in her Reformation. The Pope's Power here, a forcible fraudulent Uſurpation.*

HAving thus far examined your Doctrine, *Of keeping Faith with Hereticks*, we now return to the main Buſineſs concerning Schiſm. And his Lordſhip ſaying, *That there is difference between Departure out of the Church, and cauſeleſs thruſting from you; and therefore denying, that it is in your Power to thruſt us out of the Church*; You anſwer by a Conceſſion, *That we were thruſt out from the Church of* Rome, *but that it was not without Cauſe:* Which, that you might not ſeem to ſay *gratis*, you pretend to aſſign the Cauſes of our Expulſion. So that by your own Confeſſion, the preſent Diviſion or Separation lies at the Church of *Rome*'s Door, if it be not made evident, that there were moſt juſt and ſufficient Reaſons for her caſting the Proteſtants out of her Communion. If therefore the Church of *Rome* did thruſt the Proteſtants from her Communion, for doing nothing but what became them as Members of the *Catholick Church*, then that muſt be the Schiſmatical Party, and not the Proteſtants. For, ſuppoſing any Church (though pretending to be never ſo *Catholick*) doth reſtrain her Communion within ſuch narrow and unjuſt Bounds, that ſhe declares ſuch excommunicate, who do not approve all ſuch Errors in Doctrine and Corruptions in Practice, which the Communion of ſuch a Church may be liable to, the cauſe of that Diviſion which follows, falls upon that Church which exacts thoſe Conditions from the Members of her Communion: That is, when the Errors and Corruptions are ſuch as are dangerous to Salvation. For in this caſe, that Church hath firſt divided her ſelf from the *Catholick Church*; for, the Communion of that lying open and free to all, upon the neceſſary Conditions of Chriſtian Communion, whatever Church takes upon her to limit and incloſe the Bounds of the *Catholick*, becomes thereby divided from the Communion of the *Catholick Church:* and all ſuch who diſown ſuch an unjuſt Incloſure, do not ſo much divide from the Communion of that Church ſo incloſing, as return to the Communion of the *Primitive* and *Univerſal Church*. The *Catholick Church* therefore lies open and free, like a Common-Field to all Inhabitants; now if any particular

§. 1.

P. 146. §. 22.

P. 185. n. 1.

Number of these Inhabitants should agree together, to enclose part of it, without Consent of the rest, and not to admit any others to their right of Common, without consenting to it, which of these two Parties, those who deny to yield their Consent; or such who deny their Rights if they will not, are guilty of the Violation of the publick and common Rights of the Place? Now this is plainly the case between the Church of *Rome*, and Ours? The Communion of the Catholick Church lies open to all such who own the Fundamentals of Christian Faith, and are willing to join in the Profession of them: Now to these your Church adds many particular Doctrines, which have no Foundation in Scripture, or the Consent of the Primitive Church; these, and many Superstitious Practices, are enjoined by her, as Conditions of her Communion, so that all those are debarred any right of Communion with her, who will not approve of them; by which it appears, your Church is guilty of the first Violation of the Union of the Catholick; and whatever Number of Men are deprived of your Communion, for not consenting to your Usurpations, do not divide themselves from you, any further than you have first separated your selves from the Catholick Church. And when your Church by this Act is already separated from the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, the disowning of those things wherein your Church is become Schismatical, cannot certainly be any culpable Separation. For, whatever is so, must be from a Church so far as it is Catholick; but in our case it is from a Church so far only as it is not Catholick, *i. e.* so far as it hath divided her self from the Belief and Communion of the *Universal Church*.

P. 2. But herein a great Mistake is committed by you, when you measure the Communion of the *Catholick Church*, by the Judgment of all, or most of the particular Churches of such an Age, which supposes that the Church of some *one particular Age*, must of necessity be preserved from all Errors and Corruptions, which there is no Reason or Necessity at all to assert; and that is all the ground you have for saying, *That the Separation of Protestants was not only from the Church of* Rome, *but (as* Calvin *confesseth)* à toto mundo, *from the whole Christian World, and such a Separation necessarily involves Separation from the true Catholick Church.* Now to this, we answer two things, 1. That we have not separated from the whole Christian World in any thing wherein the whole Christian World is agreed; but to disagree from the particular Churches of the Christian World, in such things wherein those Churches differ among themselves, is not to separate from the Christian World, but to disagree in some things from such particular Churches. As I hope you will not say, That Man is divided from all Mankind, who doth in some Feature or other differ from any one particular Man; but, altho' he doth so, he doth not differ from any in those things, which are common to all; for that were to differ from all; but when he only differs from one in the Colour of his Eyes, from another in his Complexion, another in the Air of his Countenance, and so in other things; this Man, though he should differ from every particular Man in the World in something or other, yet is a Man still as well as any, because he agrees with them in that in which they all agree, which is, Humane Nature, and differs only in those Things wherein they differ from each other. And therefore from the Disagreement of the Protestants from any one particular Church, it by no means follows, that they separated from the whole Christian World, and therefore from the true Catholick Church. 2. The Communion of the Catholick Church is not to be measured by the particular Opinions and Practices of all, or any particular Churches, but by such things which are the proper Foundations of the Catholick Church. For there

there can be no Separation from the true Catholick Church, but in such things wherein it is Catholick; now it is not Catholick in any thing, but what properly relates to its Being and Constitution. For whatever else there is, however universal it may be, is extrinsecal to the Nature and Notion of the Catholick Church, and therefore supposing a Separation from the Church, in what is so extrinsecal and accidental, it is no proper Separation from the Catholick Church. As for Instance, supposing all Men were agreed, that some particular Habit should be worn all over the World, will you say, That any Number of Men who found this Habit extremely inconvenient for them, and therefore should disuse it, did on that Account separate from humane Nature, and ceased to be Men by it? Such is the case of any particular Churches laying aside some Customs or Ceremonies, which in some one Age of the Church, or more, the greatest part of Christian Churches were agreed in the Practice of; for, although this general Practice should make Men more diligent in Enquiry, and careful in what they did; yet if such a Church having Power to govern it self, see Reason to alter it, it doth not separate from the Communion of the Catholick Church therein, and therefore doth not cease to be a Church. For there is no culpable Separation from the Church Catholick, but what relates to it properly as Catholick; now that doth not relate to it as Catholick, which it may be Catholick without. Now certainly you cannot have so little Reason as to assert, that the Church cannot be Catholick without such extrinsecal and accidental Agreements. And from hence it follows, That no Church can be charged with a Separation from the true Catholick Church, but what may be proved to separate it self in some thing necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church; and so long as it doth not separate as to these Essentials, it cannot cease to be a true Member of the Catholick Church. If you would therefore prove, that the Church of *England*, upon the Reformation, is separated from the true Catholick Church; you must not think it enough to say, (which as weakly as commonly is said) *That no one particular Church can be named, which in all things agreed with it*; for that only proves, that she differed from particular Churches in such Things wherein they differed from each other, but that she is divided from all Christian Churches in such Things wherein they are all agreed, and which are essential to the Being of the Catholick Church; when you have proved this, you may expect a further Answer.

§. 3. This then can be no cause why your Church should expel the Protestants out of her Communion, but it shews us sufficient Cause to believe, that your Church had separated her self from the Communion of the Catholick. For which we must further consider, that although nothing separates a Church properly from the Catholick, but what is contrary to the Being of it; yet a Church may separate her self from the Communion of the Catholick, by taking upon her to make such Things the necessary Conditions of her Communion, which never were the Conditions of Communion with the Catholick Church. As for Instance, Though we should grant, *Adoration of the Eucharist*, *Invocation of Saints*, and *Veneration of Images* to be only superstitious Practices taken up without sufficient Grounds in the Church, yet since it appears, that the Communion of the Catholick Church was free for many Hundred Years, without approving or using these things; that Church which shall not only publickly use, but enjoyn such things upon pain of Excommunication from the Church, doth, as much as in her lies, draw the Bounds of Catholick Communion within her self, and so divides her self from the true Catholick Church. For, whatever confines, must likewise divide the Church; for by that Confinement a Separation is made between

the part confined, and the other, which Separation muſt be made by the Party ſo limiting Chriſtian Communion. As it was in the Caſe of the *Donatiſts*, who were therefore juſtly charged with Schiſm, becauſe they confined the *Catholick Church* within their own Bounds: And if any other Church doth the ſame which they did, it muſt be liable to the ſame Charge which they were, The ſum then of this Diſcourſe is, That the Being of the *Catholick Church* lies in Eſſentials, that for a particular Church to diſagree from all other particular Churches in ſome extrinſecal and accidental Things, is not to ſeparate from the *Catholick Church*, ſo as to ceaſe to be a Church; but ſtill, whatever Church makes ſuch extrinſecal Things the neceſſary Conditions of Communion, ſo as to caſt Men out of the Church, who yield not to them, is Schiſmatical in ſo doing; for it thereby divides it ſelf from the *Catholick Church:* and the Separation from it, is ſo far from being Schiſm, that being caſt out of that Church on thoſe Terms only, returns them to the Communion of the *Catholick Church.* On which Grounds it will appear, that yours is the Schiſmatical Church, and not ours. For, although before this impoſing Humour came into particular Churches, Schiſm was defined by the Fathers, and others, to be *a voluntary departure out of the Church*, yet that cannot in Reaſon be underſtood of any particular, but the *true Catholick Church;* for not only Perſons, but Churches may depart from the *Catholick Church*; and in ſuch Caſes, not thoſe who depart from the Communion of ſuch Churches, but thoſe Churches which departed from the Catholick, are guilty of the Schiſm.

Theſe things I thought neceſſary to be further explained, not only to ſhew, how falſe that Imputation is, of our Churches departing from the true *Catholick Church*, but with what Reaſon we charge your Church with departing from the Communion of it; and therefore not thoſe whom you thruſt out of Communion, but your Church ſo thruſting them out, is apparently guilty of the preſent Schiſm.

P. 158. n. 1. But ſtill you ſay, *Your Church had ſufficient cauſe for the Expulſion of Proteſtants out of her Communion*; and for this you barely repeat your former Aſſertions, and offer not at the Proof of one of them; as though you intended to carry your Cauſe, by the frequent repeating your Declaration. But, Sir, it is the Proof of what you ſay, that we expect from you, and not the bare telling us, *That Proteſtants are Schiſmaticks*, becauſe they are Schiſmaticks. When you will be at leiſure to prove, that the Proteſtants were guilty of *Heretical Doctrine, or Schiſmatical Proceedings*; that they raiſed *a new, ſeparate, and mutinous Faction of pretended Chriſtians, diſtinct from the one Catholick Body of the Church; by chuſing new Paſtors, inſtituting new Rites and Ceremonies not in their Power to do, by Schiſmatical convening in ſeveral Synods, and there broaching new heretical Confeſſions of Faith*; when I ſay, You ſhall think good to prove all, or any one of theſe, you ſhall receive ſo full an Anſwer as will make it evident, that the Proteſtants did not depart from the *Catholick Churches* Doctrine and Communion; but that the Church of *Rome*, is departed thence, firſt, by impoſing erroneous Doctrines, and ſuperſtitious Practices, as Conditions of Communion, and then by thruſting out all ſuch as would not Conſent to them.

§. 4. His Lordſhip diſputing the Terms on which a Separation in the Church
P. 146. n. 22. may be lawful, ſaith, *That Corruption in Manners only, is no ſufficient Cauſe to make a Separation in the Church. And*, ſaith he, *This is as ingenuouſly confeſſed for you, as by me. For if Corruption in Manners were a juſt Cauſe of actual Separation of one Church from another, in that Catholick Body of Chriſt, the Church of* Rome *hath given as great cauſe as any, ſince (as* Stapleton *grants)*

grants) there is scarce any Sin that can be thought on by Man (Heresie only excepted) with which that See hath not been foully stained, especially from eight hundred Years after Christ. And he need not except Heresie, into which Biel *grants it possible, the Bishops of the See may fall. And* Stella *and* Almain *grant it freely, that some of them did fall, and so ceased to be Heads of the Church, and left Christ (God be thanked) at that time of his Vicar's Defection, to look to his Cure himself.* But you tell us, *The Discovery of some few Motes, darkens not the Brightness of the Sunshine*; I wonder what you account Beams, if the Sins of your Popes and others be but Motes with you? We grant, that the Sun himself hath his *Maculæ*, but they are such as do not Eclipse his Light; we find the *Maculæ* in your Church, but we are to seek for the bright Sunshine. Or, Doth it lie *in the Service of your Religious Votaries?* For that is the great part of the conspicuous Piety of your Church, which you instance in. But, Is this indeed the *bright Sunshine of your Church*, that there are *so many thousands of both Sexes* (you do well to joyn them together) *who tie themselves by perpetual Vows, never to be dissolved by their own seeking* (and therefore doubtless pleasing to God, whether they are able to keep them or no) *and these pray* (if they understand what they say) *and sing Divine Hymns Day and Night* (which makes the Sun shine the brighter) *which you say is a strange and unheard of thing among Protestants.* What, that Men and Women (though not in Cloysters) *pray and sing Hymns to God?* no surely. For as the Devotion of our Churches is more grave and solemn, so it is likewise more pious and intelligible. *You pray and sing*, but how? Let *Erasmus* speak, who understood your praying and singing well. *Cantiunculârum, clamorum, murmurum ac bombórum ubique plus satis est, si quid ista delectant Superos.* Do you think those Prayers and Hymns are pleasing to God, which lie more in the Throat than the Heart? And such who have been wise and devout Men among your selves have been the least Admirers of your mimical, uncouth, and superstitious Devotions; but have rather condemned them as vain, ludicrous things; and wondered (as *Erasmus* said) what they thought of Christ, who imagined he could be pleased with them. (*Quid sentiunt obsecro de Christo qui putant eum ejusmodi cantiunculis delectari?*) Are these then the glorious Parts of your Devotions, *your Prayers and Hymns*? But *they pray and sing Divine Hymns Day and Night*: If this be the only Excellency of your Devotion, How much are you out-done by the ancient *Psalliani* and *Euchitæ*, that spent all their Time in Prayer, and yet were accounted *Hereticks* for their Pains? Still *you pray and sing*, but to whom? To *Saints and Angels* often, to the *Virgin Mary* with great Devotion, and most solemn Invocations; but to God himself, very sparingly in Comparison. If this then be the warm Sunshine of your Devotions, we had rather use such, wherein we may be sure of God's Blessing; which we cannot be in such Prayers and Hymns which attribute those Honours to his Creatures, which belong wholly to himself. But you *not only sing and pray*, but can be very idle too; and the Number of those Men must be called *Religious Orders*, and *the Garment of the Church is said by you to be imbroidered by the Variety of them*; and for this, *Psalm* 44. 10. is very luckily quoted. And are those indeed the Ornaments of your Church, which were become such Sinks of Wickedness, that those of your Church, who had any Modesty left were ashamed of them, and call'd loud for a Reformation? Those were indeed

Eraſm. in Mat. 6. 7.

Hodie videmus Sacerdotes, nihil dicam qualibus; sed certè nimium prolixis precibus, hisce; præscriptis, aliquoties ineptis ac ridiculis, nè dicam impiis, oneratos. Eraſm. in Mat. 6. 7. *Ad hæc qui modestè pii sunt, tacitè secum ingemiscunt: qui populi malis alantur, & quorum interest Christi gregem, quem ille suo sanguine liberum reddidit, quàm maximè servum esse & obnoxium, adeo non reclamant ut modis omnibus exaggerent. Accedunt iis qui vel ambiunt præmium aliquod obsequii vel timent pœnam libertatis. Ita dum nemo succurrit, res paulatim eo prolabitur ut penè nihil jam pudeat.* Id. in Mat. 11. 30.

indeed ſuch *Gardens* wherein it were more worth looking for *uſeful or odoriferous flowers* (as you expreſs it) than for *Diogenes* to find out an honeſt man in his Croud of Citizens. Therefore not to diſpute with you the firſt Inſtitutions of *Monaſtick Life*, nor how commendable the Nature of it is, nor the Conveniences of it, where there are no indiſpenſable Vows; the main Things we blame in them, are, the Reſtraints of men's Liberties, whatever Circumſtances they are in, the great Degeneracy of them in all Reſpects from their Primitive *Inſtitutions*, the great Snares which the Conſciences of ſuch as are engaged in them, are almoſt continually expoſed to, the unuſefulneſs of them in their multitudes to the *Chriſtian* World, the general Unſerviceableneſs of the Perſons who live in them, the great Debaucheries which they are ſubject to, and often over-run with; and if theſe then be the greateſt *Ornaments* of your *Churches Garments*, it is an eaſie Matter to eſpy the *Spots* which ſhe hath upon her. What you add *concerning the good Lives of Papiſts and bad of Proteſtants*, if taken univerſally, is as unjuſt as uncharitable; if indefinitely, it ſhews only that not the particular Lives of men on either ſide, but the Tendency of the *Doctrine*, to promote or hinder the Sanctity of them, is here to be regarded. And to that you ſpeak afterwards, but in a moſt falſe and virulent manner, when you
P. 160. ſay, *That though ſins be committed among you, they are not defended or juſtified as good works; whereas, among Proteſtants, Darkneſs it ſelf is called Light, and the greateſt of all Sins*, viz. *Hereſie, Schiſm, Sacrilege, Rebellion*, &c. *together with all the bad ſpawn they leave behind them, are cryed up for perfect Virtue, Zeal, good Reformation, and what not*? I doubt not but you would be ready to defend and juſtifie this open *Raillery* of yours, and call it a *good Work*, notwithſtanding what you ſaid before. If we had a mind to follow you in ſuch Things, How eaſie a matter were it to rip up all the *Frauds, Impoſtures, Villanies* of all ſorts and kinds which have been committed by thoſe who have ſate in your *Infallible Chair*, and charge them all on your *Church*, with much more Juſtice than you do the Miſcarriages of any under the name of *Proteſtants*? For the *Proteſtant Churches* diſown ſuch Perſons, and condemn thoſe Practices with the greateſt Indignation; whereas you excuſe, palliate, and plead for the Lives of the *Popes*, as much as you dare, and not out-face the *Sun* at *Noon*, which hath laid open their *Villanies*. Where do the Principles of *Proteſtants* incourage or plead for *Hereſie, Schiſm, Sacrilege, Rebellion*, &c. much leſs cry them up as *Heroical Actions*? Doth not the *Church* of *England* diſown and diſclaim ſuch Things to the uttermoſt? Have not her *Sufferings* made it appear, how great a hater ſhe is of *Hereſies, Schiſm, Sacrilege*, and *Rebellion*? Did ſhe ever cry up thoſe for *Martyrs*, who died in *Gun-powder Treaſons*? Did ſhe ever teach it lawful to diſobey Heretical *Princes*, and to take away their lives? Yet theſe Things have been done by you, and the Doers of them not condemned, but rather fomented and incouraged, as zealous Promoters of the *Holy See*, and moſt devout Sons of the *Church* of *Rome*. Ceaſe therefore to charge the guilt of Perſons diſowned by the *Church* of *England* upon her; when you are unwilling to hear of the Faults of thoſe Perſons among your ſelves, whom you dare not diſown, I mean your *Popes* and *Jeſuits*.

§. 5. Leaving therefore theſe unbecoming *Railleries* of yours, and that which occaſioneth them, *viz. Corruption of Manners*; we come to conſider that, which is more pertinent to our Purpoſe, *viz. Errors in Doctrine*; which his Lordſhip truly aſſigned as the ground of the *Reformation, and not only*
P. 147. n. 2. *that there were doctrinal Errors in your Church, but that ſome of the Errors of the* Roman *Church were dangerous to Salvation. For it is not every light*

Error

Error in disputable Doctrine and Points of curious Speculation, that can be a just Cause of Separation, in that admirable Body of Christ, which is his Church, or of one Member of it from another. But, that there are Errors in Doctrine, and some of them such as most manifestly endanger Salvation in the Church of Rome, *is evident to them that will not shut their Eyes. The Proof* (his Lordship saith) *runs through the particular Points, and so is too long for this Discourse.* Now to this you manfully answer, *That in vain do they attempt to reform the Church of what she can never be guilty.* Which, if it depends on your Churches Infallibility (which is largely disproved already) must needs fall to the Ground with it. And it is an excellent Answer when a Church is charged actually with erring, to say, *She doth not err*, because *she cannot:* Which is all that you give us here. But if you prove it no better than you have done, the Heretical and Schismatical Obstinacy is like to be found in that Church which in her Errors challenges Infallibility. P. 162.

The Question now comes to this, *Whether, Errors being supposed in the Doctrine, and Corruptions in the Communion of a Church, when the General Church would not reform, it was not lawful for particular Churches to reform themselves?* To this his Lordship answers affirmatively, in these Words. *Is it then such a strange thing, that a particular Church may reform it self, if the general will not? I had thought, and do so still, that in Point of Reformation of either Manners or Doctrine, it is lawful for the Church, since Christ, to do as the Church before Christ did, and might do. The Church before Christ consisted of Jews and Proselytes: This Church came to have a Separation, upon a most ungodly Policy of* Jeroboam's, *so that it never pieced together again. To a Common Council to reform all, they would not come. Was it not lawful for* Judah *to reform her self, when* Israel *would not join? Sure it was, or else the Prophet deceives me, that says expressly, Though* Israel *transgress, yet let not* Judah *Sin. And S.* Hierom *expounds it of this very particular Sin of Heresie and Error in Religion.* After which he proves, *That* Israel, *during this Separation, was a true Church.* Which we shall insist on, when we have considered what Answer you return to his Lordship's Argument, which lies in these two things; First, *That* Judah *did not reform her self.* Secondly, *That* Judah *is not the Protestant Party, as his Lordship supposeth it to be.* First, You say, *Judah did not reform her self. For* Judah *being the Orthodox Church, united with her Head the High Priest, and not tainted with any Doctrinal Errors, What need was there of her Reformation? And so the meaning of that Place, Though* Israel *transgress, yet let not* Judah *Sin, is rather against, than for him, because the Sense is rather, Let not* Judah *fall into Schism, though* Israel *does, than, let* Judah *reform her self.* But if it appears that *Judah* had Corruptions crept into her, as well as *Israel* had, though not so great, and universal, then it follows, that by these Words *Judah* had Power to reform her self. And the Antecedent is clear to any one who takes the Pains to read the Scripture, and compare the Places in it, more than it seems you do. For, Doth not this very Prophet check *Judah* as well as *Israel, for transgressing God's Covenant?* Doth he not say, *That God had a Controversie with* Judah, *and would punish* Jacob *according to his ways?* And for all this, Was there no need of Reformation in the Church of *Judah?* Indeed, in one place it is said, *That* Judah *ruleth with God, and is faithful with his Saints;* but then that is to be understood of *Judah*, when she had reformed her self in the Days of *Hezekiah:* for surely you will not say, That *Judah* did not stand in need of Reformation, when *Hezekiah* began his Reign; for it is said of him, *That he removed the High Places, and brake the Images, and cut down the Groves.* And were not these things which wanted P. 149. sect. 24. Hos. 4. 15. P. 160. n. 2. Hos. 6. 47. Hos. 12. 2. Hos. 11. 12. 2 King 18. 4

ed

ed Reformation, think you? If we conſider the Times of thoſe three
Hoſ. 1. 1. Kings before *Hezekiah*, in which *Hoſea* propheſied; we ſhall ſee, what need there was of Reformation among them, and thoſe were *Uzziah*, *Jotham*, and *Ahaz*; of the time of *Uzziah*, call'd *Azariah*, in the Book of *Kings*, it
2 King. 15. 4. v. 35. is ſaid, *That the High Places were not removed, but the People ſacrificed and burnt Incenſe ſtill on the High Places*; the ſame is affirmed of the time of *Jotham* in the ſame Chapter; ſo that though theſe Princes were good themſelves, yet there were many Corruptions ſtill among the People. But of *Ahaz* it is ſaid expreſly, *That he walked in the way of the Kings of* Iſrael; *and*
2 King. 16. 3, 4. *he ſacrificed and burnt Incenſe in the High Places, and on the Hills, and under every green Tree.* Chuſe now which of theſe three you pleaſe (for it is moſt improbable thoſe Words, conſidering the long Time of *Hoſea*'s Prophecy, ſhould be ſpoken in the Time of *Hezekiah* the laſt of the four Kings he propheſied under). And will you tell us again, *That the Church of* Judah *needed no Reformation?* But you offer at a Reaſon for it, *Becauſe ſhe was united with her Head the High-Prieſt at* Hieruſalem. So then, belike as long as *Judah* and the High-Prieſt were united, ſhe could be guilty of no Doctrinal Errors: No, not although ſhe ſhould pronounce Chriſt a Blaſphemer, and condemn him to be crucified as a Malefactor; for then certainly *Judah*
2 King. 16. 10, 11. and the High-Prieſt were united. But, I know you will ſay, *You ſpake this of the Time before the Meſſias was come.* And was it then true, that *as long as* Judah *was united with her Head, the High-Prieſt, there was no need of Reformation?* What think you then of the time of *Ahaz*, when *Uzziah* the *Prieſt built an Altar at the Command of* Ahaz, *according to the Pattern of the Altar of* Damaſcus, contrary to God's expreſs Law: yet, according to you, *as long as* Judah *was united with her Head, the High-Prieſt*, there was nothing which needed Reformation. And, although it be plainly affirmed, that
2 King. 17. 19. Judah *kept not the Commands of the Lord their God, but walked in the Statutes of* Iſrael *which they had made*; yet you, who, it ſeems, knew *Judah*'s Innocency better than God, or the Prophets did, ſay very magiſterially, That as long as ſhe was united with her Head the High-Prieſt, what need, I pray, was there of her Reformation? And this being the Caſe of *Judah*, I may eaſily grant you, *That* Judah *is not the Proteſtant Party, but that of the* Roman *Church*, i. e. *while* Judah *was under her Corruptions; and yet, you ſay, ſhe needed no Reformation*, ſhe is the fitteſt Parallel you could think of for your Church; but we pretend to no Parallel between *Judah* and the Proteſtant Party, in *not needing a Reformation*, but in her Power to reform her ſelf. Which we ſay ſtill, that ſhe had, *though* Iſrael *would not join with her*, by virtue of theſe Words of the Prophet, *Though* Iſrael *tranſgreſs, yet let not* Judah *Sin:* thereby manifeſting, that though the greateſt Part was degenerated in the Ten Tribes, yet *Judah* might prevent the ſame in herſelf, by reforming thoſe Abuſes which were crept among them; And therefore the Senſe of thoſe Words, *Let not Judah Sin*, muſt in this Caſe imply *a Power to reform her ſelf.* If therefore we ſpeak of *Judah* degenerated, we grant the Parallel lies wholly between *Judah* and the Church of *Rome*; for, although there were great Corruptions in *Judah*, and as great in your Church, yet with the ſame Reaſon you ſay, That *neither needed Reformation:* But if we ſpeak of *Judah reforming herſelf* under *Hezekiah*, then we ſay, The Parallel lies between *Judah* and the Proteſtant Party; whatever you ſay to the contrary. But you ſhrewdly ask; *If you be*
Ibid. Judah, *Who, I pray, are the revolted Ten Tribes? Who are of* Jeroboam's *Cabal?* Even they who ſet up the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel:* Such who worſhip Images inſtead of the true God; though they intend them only

as

as Symbols of the Divine Presence; for no more did *Jeroboam* and the *Israelites* intend by their Calves, and there is no Pretence which you use to justifie your selves from Idolatry, but will excuse *Jeroboam*, and the Ten Tribes from it. If the Protestant Party then be *Judah*, it is easie finding out the revolted Ten Tribes, and *Jeroboam*'s Cabal, the Court of *Rome* answering to this, as the Church of *Rome* doth to the other. *But we cannot be* Judah, *because we left the Catholick* Jerusalem, *that is* Rome *the City of Peace:* By whom, I pray, was *Rome* Christened the *Catholick Jerusalem?* For if we consider the Worship there used, and the politick Ends of it, it much more looks like *Samaria*, or *Dan*, and *Bethel*. If *Rome* be our *Catholick Jerusalem*, shew us, When God made choice of that, for the peculiar Place of his Worship? Where we are commanded to resort thither for Divine Worship? When God placed his Name there, as he did of old in *Jerusalem?* When you have shewed us these Things, we may think the worse of our selves for leaving *Rome*, but not before. And, let the World judge, Whether it be more likely one should meet with the Worship of Golden Calves at *Rome*, or among the Protestants? It is you who have found out *new Sacrifices*, *new Objects of Worship*, *new Rites and Ceremonies* in it, *new Altars*, and consequently *new Priests* too; and yet for all this, you must be *orthodox* Judah, *which needed no Reformation?* And who, I pray, do in point of Obedience most resemble the Ten Tribes? Have not you set up a Spiritual *Jeroboam*, as a new Head of the Church, in Opposition to the Son of *David?* And that you may advance the Interest of this Spiritual Head, you raise his Authority far above that of Kings and Temporal Princes, whom you ought to be subject to; declaring it in his Power to excommunicate, depose, and absolve Subjects from Obedience to them. And therefore is not the Parallel between the Ten Tribes, and the Church of *Rome*, very pat, and much to the purpose? But when you would seem to return this upon us by a false and scurrilous Parallel between *Jeroboam*, and that *excellent Princess Queen* P. 161.
Elizabeth in the Reformation of the Church of *England*, you only betray the Badness of your Cause, which makes Detractions so necessary to maintain it: For as her Title to the Crown was undoubted, so her Proceedings in the Reformation were such as are warranted by the Law of God, and the Nation; and her Carriage in her Reign towards Jesuits and Priests, no other than what the apparent Necessity of her own and her Kingdoms Preservation put her upon. But if she must be accounted like *Jeroboam*, for banishing Priests and Jesuits often convicted of treasonable Practices, upon pain of Death if they were found in *England*; What must we think of the *Catholick* Jerusalem, *the City of Peace*, that sweet and gentle Mother the Church of *Rome*, that hath carried her self so peaceably towards those who have dissented from her? Witness the Blood of so many Hundred Thousands which she hath imbrued her Hands in, meerly for opposing her Doctrines and Superstitions, witness that excellent School of Humanity the *Inquisition*, and the easie Lessons she teaches those who come under her Discipline there; witness the Proceedings in *England* in the Days of Queen *Mary*; and then let any judge if the Parallel must be carried by Cruelty towards Dissenters, which of their two Reigns came the nearest that of *Jeroboam*. The only true Words then that you say, are, *but enough of this Parallel*; and more than enough too of such impudent Slanders against the Memory of that famous Queen: But your Church would have been more unlike the Ten Tribes, if there had not been a lying Prophet there.

You dispute very manfully against his Lordship, for asserting, *That* Is- Ibid.
rael *remained a Church after the Separation between* Judah *and the Ten Tribes*;

and yet, after you have ſpent many Words about it, you yield all that he
P. 162. aſſerts; when you ſay, *That in a general Senſe they were called the People of God, as they were* Abraham's *Seed, according to the Fleſh, by Reaſon of the Promiſe made to* Abraham, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee.* And what is there more than this, that his Lordſhip contends for? For he never dreamt that the Ten Tribes were *Abraham's Seed according to the Spirit*; but only ſays, *That there was Salvation for thoſe Thouſands that had not bowed their Knees to* Baal, *which cannot be in the ordinary Way where there is no Church.* And if, as you ſay, *Abraham's Seed only according to the Spirit*, i. e. the Faithful, make the true Church; then it follows, Where there were ſo many faithful, there muſt needs be a true Church. And thus for any thing you have ſaid to the contrary, his Lordſhip's Argument from the caſe of *Judah* holds for every particular Church's Power to reform it ſelf, when the General will not reform.

§. 6. His Lordſhip further argues, *That to reform what is amiſs in Doctrine or*
P. 150. n. 2. *Manners, is as lawful for a particular Church, as it is to publiſh and promulgate any thing that is Catholick in either. And your Queſtion,* Quo Judice? *lies alike againſt both. And yet, I think,* ſaith he, *It may be proved, that the Church of* Rome, *and that as a particular Church, did promulgate an Orthodox Truth, which was not then Catholickly admitted in the Church; namely, the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son. If ſhe erred in this Fact, confeſs her Error; if ſhe erred not, Why may not another particular Church do as ſhe did?* From whence he infers, *That if a particular Church may publiſh any thing that is Catholick, where the whole Church is ſilent; it may reform any thing that is not Catholick, where the whole Church is negligent, or will not.*
P. 162. n. 3. Now to this you anſwer, 1. *That this Proceſſion from the Son, was a Truth always acknowledged in the Church*; but what concerns that, *and the Time*
P. 164. *of this Article being inſerted into the Creed*, have been ſo amply diſcuſſed already, that I ſhall not cloy the Reader with any Repetition, having fully conſidered whatever you here ſay concerning the Article it ſelf, or its Ad-
P. 163. dition to the Creed. 2. You anſwer, *That the Conſequence will not hold, that if a particular Church may in ſome caſe promulgate an Orthodox Truth, not as yet Catholickly received by the Church, then a particular Church may repeal, or reverſe any thing that the whole Church hath already Catholickly and definitively received? Surely no. Yet this* (ſay you) *is his Lordſhips, and the Proteſtants Caſe.* You do well to mention an egregious Fallacy preſently after theſe Words; for ſurely this is ſo. For doth his Lordſhip parallel the Promulgating ſomething Catholick, and repealing ſomething Catholick together? Surely no. But the promulgating ſomething true, but not Catholickly received with the reforming ſomething not Catholick. Either therefore you had a mind to abuſe his Lordſhip's Words, or to deceive the Reader by begging the thing in Queſtion, *viz. that all thoſe which we call for a Reformation of, were things Catholickly and definitively received by the whole Church*: which you know we utterly deny. But you go on, and ſay, *That thence it follows not, that a particular Church may reform any thing that is not Catholick, where the whole Church is negligent, or will not, becauſe this would ſuppoſe Error, or ſomething uncatholick, to be taught or admitted by the whole Church.* To put this caſe a little more plainly by the former Inſtance; Suppoſe then that the Worſhip of God under the Symbols of the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, had been received generally as the viſible Worſhip of the Tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin*, as well as the reſt; Doth not this Anſwer of yours make it impoſſible that ever they ſhould return to the true Worſhip of God? For this were to call in queſtion the Truth of God's Promiſe

to

to his *Church*; and *to suppose something not Catholick to be received by the whole Church.* And so the greater the Corruptions are, the more impossible it is to cure them; and in case they spread generally, no Attempts of Reformation can be lawful: which is a more false and paradoxical Doctrine than either of those which you call so. And the Truth is, such Pretences as these are, are fit only for a Church that hateth to be reformed; for if something not good in it self, should happen in any one Age to overspread the visible Communion of all particular Churches, this only makes a Reformation the more necessary; so far is it from making it the more disputable. For thereby those Corruptions grow more dangerous, and every particular Church is bound the more to regard its own Security in a time of general Infection. And if any other Churches neglect themselves, What Reason is it that the rest should? For, any or all other particular Churces neglecting their Duty, is no more an Argument, that no particular Church should reform it self, than that if all other Men in a Town neglect preserving themselves from the Plague, than I am bound to neglect it too. But you answer, 3. *That all this doth not justifie the Protestants Proceedings, because they promulged only new and unheard of Doctrines, directly contrary to what the Catholick Church universally held and taught before them for Catholick Truths.* This is the great thing in Question; but I see, you love best the lazy Trade of begging Things, which are impossible to be rationally proved.

But yet you would seem here to do something towards it in the subsequent Words; *For about the Year of our Lord* 1517. *when their pretended Reformations began, was not the real Presence of our Saviour's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, by a true substantial change of Bread and Wine, generally held by the whole Church? Was not the real Sacrifice of the Mass then generally believed? Was not Veneration of Holy Images, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Praying for the dead, that they might be eased of their Pains, and receive the full Remission of their Sins generally used and practised by all Christians? Was not Free Will, Merit of good Works, and Justification by Charity, or inherent Grace, and not by Faith only, universally taught and believed in all Churches of* Christendom? *Yea, even among those who in some few other Points dissented from the Pope, and the Latin Church? To what purpose then doth the Bishop urge, that a particular Church may publish any thing that is Catholick? This doth not justifie at all his Reformation; he should prove that it may not only add, but take away something that is Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church; for this the pretended Reformers did, as well in* England *as elsewhere.* His Lordship never pretends, much less disputes, that any particular Church hath a Power to take away any thing that is truly Catholick; but the ground why he supposeth, such Things as those mentioned by you, might be taken away, is, because they are not Catholick; the Question then is between us, Whether they were Catholick Doctrines or not: This you attempt to prove by this *Medium, Because they were generally held by the whole Church at the Time of the Reformation.* To which I answer, 1. If this be a certain Measure to judge by, what was Catholick and what not; then what doth not appear to have been Catholick in this Sense, it was in our Churches Power to reject, and so it was lawful to reform our selves as to all such Things which were not at the time of the Reformation received by the whole Church. And what think you now of the *Pope's Supremacy*, your *Churches Infallibility*, the *necessity of Cœlibacy in the Clergy*, *Communion in one kind*, *Prayer in an unknown Tongue*, *Indulgences*, &c. Will you say, That those were generally received by the Church at the time of the Reformation? If you could have said so,

§. 7. Ibid.

no doubt you would not have omitted ſuch neceſſary Points, and ſome of which gave the firſt Occaſion to the Reformation. If then theſe were not Catholickly received, a particular Church might without Schiſm reject them, and ſo the Church of *England* is ſufficiently vindicated from Schiſm by your ſelf, as to theſe Points here mentioned, which you willingly omitted, becauſe you could not but know how far they were from being univerſally received in all Churches in *Chriſtendom*?

2. As to thoſe Things which you inſiſt on, you give no ſufficient Evidence at all, that they were received by the *whole Church as Catholick Doctrines*. For, ſo far it is from appearing, that theſe were held as Catholick Doctrines by all Churches in the Chriſtian World (for then you do moſt unreaſonably condemn the *Greek*, and *Abyſſine Churches*, &c. for Hereſie or Schiſm, if they owned all Catholick Doctrines; and they muſt do ſo, if they agreed with your Church in all theſe Things, which are the only Doctrines you mention as Catholick, in Oppoſition to ſuch whom you condemn for Hereſie or Schiſm; and if the Agreement of all Churches be the meaſure of what is Catholick, then thoſe Doctrines cannot be ſo, which thoſe great Churches differ from you in, by your own Argument) but, ſo far is it, I ſay, from appearing, that theſe were held ſo by all Churches in *Chriſtendom*, that you cannot prove they were ſo held in the Church of *Rome* her ſelf, before the Reformation. The Church of *Rome* I take here in the largeſt Senſe, as it takes in all ſuch who were the viſible Members of her Communion. Now, I hope you will not ſay, That ſuch Doctrines are received as Catholick Doctrines, which are imbraced only by a Party in your Church, another Party oppoſing it, both which ſtill remain Members of your Communion; for whatever is received as a Catholick Doctrine (according to you) is ſo received, that thoſe who deny or doubt of it, do thereby become no Members of the viſible Communion of that Church; which is by the Churches ſo declaring her ſelf in thoſe Points, that ſhe admits none to her Communion, but upon the Acknowledgement of them. Now, Will you ſay, This was the caſe of your Church, as to theſe Doctrines at the beginning of the *Reformation*? Were *Tranſubſtantiation*, *real Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*, *Veneration of Images*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, &c. ſo defined then by your Church to be Articles of Faith, that whoever did not aſſent to them, was declared excommunicate, and caſt out of your Church? If not, it is impoſſible, upon your own Grounds, to prove, that theſe were univerſally held and believed as Catholick Doctrines of your Church. I do not ſay, As truly Catholick Doctrines in themſelves; for, whatever your Church defines concerning them, they are not more or leſs ſo in themſelves for your Churches Definition; but, I ſay, you cannot aſſert that theſe were held by your Church to be Catholick Doctrines, till they were defined to be ſuch. For, according to your Principles, that which differenceth a Catholick Doctrine from a particular Opinion, is the Church's Definition; before then the Church had paſſed a Definition in theſe Points, they could not be held as Catholick Doctrines. To make this ſomewhat clearer, becauſe it is neceſſary for undeceiving thoſe who are told, as you tell us here, That at the Reformation we rejected ſuch Things which were univerſally owned for Catholick Doctrines, which is ſo far from being true, that it is impoſſible they ſhould be owned for ſuch by the Church of *Rome* upon your own Principles. For, I pray, tell us, Are there not ſeveral ſorts of Opinions among you at this Day, none of which are pretended to be Catholick Doctrines? And this you conſtantly tell us, when we object to you your Diſſentions about them. As for Inſtance, the *Pope's perſonal Infallibility*, the

the *Superiority of Pope over General Councils*, the *Immaculate Conception* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, the Diſputes about *Prædeſtination*, &c. when we tell you of your Differences in theſe Points, you anſwer, That theſe hinder not the Unity of the Church, becauſe theſe are only in Matters of Opinion; and that it is not *de fide*, that Men ſhould hold either way. When we demand the Reaſon of this difference concerning theſe Things, your Anſwer is, *That the Church hath defined ſome Things to be believed, and not others; that what the Church hath defined, is to be looked on as Catholick Doctrine, and the deniers of it are guilty of Hereſie; but where the Church hath not defined, thoſe are not Catholick Doctrines, but only at beſt but pious Opinions, and Men may be good Catholicks, and yet differ about them.* I pray, tell me, Is this your Doctrine, or, is it not? If not, there may be Hereticks within your Church, as well as without; if it be your Doctrine, apply it to the Matters in Hand. Were theſe Things defined by the Church at the beginning of the Reformation? If they were, produce thoſe Definitions for all thoſe Things which you ſay were owned as Catholick Doctrines then: that we may ſee, that at leaſt in the Judgment of your Church they were accounted ſo. Tell us, when and where thoſe Doctrines were defined before the Council of *Trent*? and, I hope you will not ſay, that was before the beginning of the Reformation. If then there were no ſuch Definitions concerning them, they could not by your Church be accounted as Catholick Doctrines; at the moſt, they could be but only pious Opinions, as that of the Pope's Infallibility among you is, and conſequently Men might be Catholicks ſtill, though they diſputed or denied them. And how then come the Proteſtants to be accounted Hereticks in their Reformation, if upon your own Principles, thoſe Things which they denied were then no Catholick Doctrines: Though you ſhould therefore prove more than you have done, That theſe Points of Doctrine were generally received at the time of the Reformation, yet that by no means proves that they were Catholick Doctrines, unleſs you make it impoſſible that meer Opinions ſhould be generally received in your Church. For, if any thing may be generally received in the nature of an Opinion, you cannot prove from the bare general Reception, that it was a Catholick Doctrine: unleſs you would attempt to prove it by the Notion under which it was received, Whether as an Opinion, or a Catholick Doctrine.

But then you muſt remember to prove theſe Things, 1. That all thoſe who did receive it, received it under that Notion; as for Inſtance, In any one of thoſe Articles by you mentioned, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, &c. you muſt firſt prove, That all who were in your Church's Communion did believe thoſe Things, which it is impoſſible for you to do, unleſs you could prove, that none could be of your Church, unleſs they believed them; which is again impoſſible to be done, unleſs your Church had ſo defined thoſe Things, that they ceaſed to be Members of it who did not believe them. Thus, we ſee, your firſt Task is rendred impoſſible, *viz.* to know, Whether all in your Church held theſe Doctrines or no; but, ſuppoſe you knew this, it falls ſhort of your Purpoſe, unleſs you can prove, that all thoſe who held theſe Things, did not hold them as bare Opinions, but as Catholick Doctrines; and this is again as impoſſible as the former; for, How can you tell, whether they judged theſe things to be ſo, unleſs you knew what their Rule was whereby they judged of Catholick Doctrines? If you knew their Rule, How can you tell, Whether they made a right Uſe of it or no? or, Whether they made any Uſe at all of it? or, Whether they did not take up ſuch Opinions by Prejudice, Education, the Judgment of others, and ſeveral other Ways, without examining of what Nature

§. 8.

nature or importance the things were. If you think you have a certain Rule to judge of *Catholick Doctrines* by, you must prove that they had the same Rule, and looked upon it as such too: otherwise they might not use it for those Ends, nor be governed at all by it. When you will therefore prove any Doctrines to be *Catholick*, by being generally received, you must remember what brave Impossibilities you have undertaken. But, suppose you could master this too, and prove, that men generally received these as *Catholick Doctrines*; yet, before you can prove, that these are *Catholick Doctrines* from thence, you have a further task yet upon you, which is, to prove it impossible that these men should be *out* in their Judgment concerning the Nature of an Opinion, and that they could not look on any thing as a *Catholick Doctrine*, but what was really so. For, if they may be mistaken in their Judgment, we are as far to seek as ever, for knowing what are *Catholick Doctrines*, and what not. You must therefore prove the Judgment of all these Persons *infallible* concerning what are *Catholick Doctrines*, and what not: And by that time, the *Pope* will return you little Thanks for your pains, in making every Member of your *Church* as *infallible* as himself. If it be then so impossible to prove, that these were received as *Catholick Doctrines*, either from any definition of your Church, or from the general Reception of them among the members of it, you see, what little reason you had to say, *That the Protestants at the beginning of the Reformation, did take away something that was Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church.* Which is notoriously false and inconsistent with your own Principles. If we should therefore grant, that *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, &c. *were generally owned in your Church at the time of the Reformation*, the utmost you can prove, is, only that they were owned as *particular Doctrines* by particular Men, but not that they were owned as the *Catholick Doctrines* of your *Church*. And therefore we deny not, but that *Party* and *Faction* in your *Church* which owned and contended for these, had got the upper-hand of the other, before the time of the Reformation, so that those who doubted of, or denied them, durst not appear so publickly as their Adversaries did; but they were but a *Party*, and a *Faction* still, and there were many outward Members of your *Church*, who groaned under the Abuses and Tyrannies of the prevailing *Faction*, and call'd loud for a *Reformation*. As appeared not only by the open Testimonies of some against such Doctrines; the sad Complaint of others for want of Reformation; but by the general sense of the Necessity of it, at the time when it was set upon, the great Applause it met with among all Persons who allowed themselves Liberty to enquire into Things, the general consent of the main Bodies of those who set about reforming themselves in the main Articles of *Christian Doctrine*, and *unanimous Opposition* to those erroneous Opinions which you call *Catholick Doctrines*. So that these were not at the time of the Reformation, so much as the owned *Catholick Doctrines* of the *Roman Church*; but the Opinions of a *prevailing Faction* in it: and therefore the disowning them, is no rejecting any thing *Catholick*, but rejecting the Opinions and Practices of a tyrannical and usurping Faction. There must be then a great deal of difference put between the State and Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*, before the beginning of the Reformation, and since, especially since the *Council* of *Trent*. For then these *Doctrines* were owned by a *Faction*, but yet there might have been Communion with that *Church*, without believing them to be *Catholick Doctrines*; and no doubt, many pious Souls went to Heaven without believing any of these Things, (*viz.* such who believed and improved the common Principles of *Christianity*,

ſtianity, without regarding the erroneous Doctrines, or ſuperſtitious Practices of thoſe among whom they lived) but upon the firſt Stirrings towards a Reformation, the Court of *Rome* was ſo far from reforming the Abuſes which were complained of, that they ſought to inforce them with the greateſt Severity upon all Perſons, thundering out Excommunications againſt all ſuch who ſhould queſtion or diſpute them. By which Means thoſe who might have lived peaceably before within the external Communion of that Church, without conſenting to the Errors of it, are now forced out of it, unleſs they would approve of ſuch Things which their Conſciences deteſted; in Compariſon with the Peace of which, they accounted not their Lives to be dear to them, as many Thouſands of them made it appear in ſeveral Countries. This is the true and juſt Account of the State of things at the beginning of the Reformation; but afterwards, when through the Neceſſity of the Pope's Affairs, a Council was ſummoned, and all the Arts imaginable were made uſe of, to ſteer that grand Affair for the Intereſt of the Court of *Rome*; a new Scene of Affairs appears in the Chriſtian World; thoſe Doctrines which before were owned only by particular Men, are defined by Pope and Council, to be the Catholick Doctrines of the *Roman* Church, and all thoſe Anathematized who will not own them. By which means the *Roman* Church is become it ſelf that Party and Faction, which only prevailed in it before but with Reluctancy and Oppoſition; and now, none are looked on as Members of that Church, but ſuch as own the Definitions of that Council in point of Doctrine. Which makes it vaſtly to differ from what it was before, as to the Terms of its Communion, and the ſtate of the Perſons who remain in it, who can neither enjoy that freedom in Judgment which they might uſe before, nor yet can pretend thoſe Excuſes for not knowing the Errors and Corruptions of that Church, which might have prevented Obſtinacy in them before. So that upon the whole it appears, that the Proteſtants in the beginning of the Reformation, were ſo far from taking away any thing that was received as a Catholick Doctrine, by all Chriſtian Churches, that they did not reject any thing which could be looked on as the Catholick Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; and conſequently that the Proteſtants were ſo far from a wilful Separation from the Church of *Rome*, that they were driven out by a prevalent Faction, which impoſed thoſe Things which had been before only the Errors of particular Perſons, as the Catholick Doctrines of that Church, and the neceſſary Conditions of Communion with her.

3. I may anſwer yet further, That it is not enough to prove any Doctrine to be Catholick, that it was generally received by Chriſtian Churches in any one Age; but it muſt be made appear, to have been ſo received from the Apoſtles times. So that if we ſhould grant, that theſe Doctrines were owned for Catholick, not only by the Church of *Rome*, but all other Chriſtian Churches (ſo far as it can be diſcerned by their Communion) yet this doth not prove theſe Doctrines ſo owned to be truly Catholick, unleſs you can firſt prove, that all the *Chriſtian Churches of one Age* can never believe a Doctrine to be Catholick, which is not ſo. You ſee therefore your Task increaſes further upon you: for, it is not enough to ſay, That *A. D.* 1517. ſuch and ſuch Doctrines were looked on as Catholick, and therefore they were ſo; but that for 1517. Years, ſucceſſively from the Apoſtles to that Time, they were judged to be ſo, and then we ſhall more eaſily believe you. When you will therefore prove *Tranſubſtantiation*, the *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, *Image-Worſhip*, *Invocation of Saints*, or any other of the good Doctrines mentioned by you, in a conſtant Tradition from the Apoſtles Times to have been looked

looked on as Catholick Doctrines, you may then ſay. That Proteſtants in denying theſe, did take away ſomething Catholick from the Doctrine of the Church; but, till that time, theſe Anſwers may abundantly ſuffice.

§. 9. We now come cloſer to the Buſineſs of the Reformation; but, before we examine the Particulars of it, the general Grounds on which it proceeded, muſt ſomewhat further be cleared, which his Lordſhip tells you, are

P. 164. n. 6. built *upon the Power of particular Churches reforming themſelves, in caſe the whole Church is negligent, or will not*; to which you ſay, *That you grant in effect as great Power as the Biſhop himſelf does, to particular Churches, to National and Provincial Councils, in reforming Errors and Abuſes either of Doctrine or Practice: only we require that they proceed with due reſpect to the chief Paſtor of the Church, and have Recourſe to him in all Matters and Decrees of Faith, eſpecially when they define or declare Points not generally known and acknowledged to be Catholick Truths.* What you grant in effect at firſt, you in effect deny again afterwards. For the Queſtion is about Reformation of ſuch Errors and Abuſes as may come from the Church of *Rome*; and when you grant a Power to reform only, in caſe the Pope conſent, you grant no Power to reform at all. For the Experience of the World hath ſufficiently taught us, How little his Conſent is to be expected in any thing of Reformation. For his Lordſhip truly ſaith, in Anſwer to *Capellus*, who denies particular Churches any Power of making Canons of Faith, without con-

P. 151. n. 3. ſulting the *Roman* See, *That as* Capellus *can never prove that the* Roman *See muſt be conſulted with before any Reformation be made: So it is as certain, that, were it proved and practiſed, we ſhould have no Reformation. For it would be long enough before the Church ſhould be cured, if that See alone ſhould be her Phyſician, which in Truth is her Diſeaſe.* Now to this you ſay, *That even* Capellus *himſelf requires this*; as though *Capellus* were not the Man whom his Lordſhip anſwers as to this very thing. But beſides you ſay, *The Practice of the Church is evident for it, in the Examples of the Milevitan and Carthaginian Councils, which, as St.* Auſtin *witneſſeth, ſent their Decrees touching Grace, Original Sin in Infants, and other Matters againſt* Pelagius, *to be confirmed by the Pope*; but what is all this to the Buſineſs of Reformation, that nothing of that Nature is to be attempted without the Pope's Conſent? That theſe Councils did by *Julius* an *African* Biſhop, communicate their Decrees to Pope *Innocent*, who denies? but, what is it you would thence infer to your Purpoſe? For the utmoſt which can be drawn hence, is, that they deſired the Pope to contribute his Aſſiſtance in condemning *Pelagius* and *Cœleſtius*; by adding the Authority of the Apoſtolical See to their Decrees: that ſo by the Conſent of the Church, that growing Hereſie might the more eaſily be ſuppreſſed. And who denies but at that time the Roman Church had great Reputation, (which is all that Authority implies) and by that Means might be more ſerviceable in preventing the growth of *Pelagianiſm*, if it did concur with the *African* Councils in condemning that Doctrine? But becauſe they communicated their Decrees to Pope *Innocent*, deſiring his Conſent with them, that therefore no Reformation ſhould be attempted in the Church, without the Conſent of the Pope is a very far-fetched Inference; and unhappily drawn from thoſe *African* Fathers, who ſo ſtoutly oppoſed *Zoſimus*, *Innocent*'s Succeſſor, in the caſe of Appeals about the Buſineſs of *Apiarius*. Did they, think you, look on themſelves as obliged to do nothing in the reforming the Church without the Pope's Authority, who would by no Means yield to thoſe Encroachments of Power, which *Zoſimus* would have uſurped over them? Nay it appears, that, till the *African* Fathers had better informed him,

Zoſimus

Zoſimus did not a little favour *Cæleſtius* himſelf, and in caſe he had gone on ſo to do, do you think they would have thought themſelves ever the leſs obliged to reform their Churches from the *Pelagian* Hereſie which began to ſpread among them? And in this time of the Controverſie between *Zoſimus* and them, though they carried it with all Fairneſs towards the *Roman* See, yet they were ſtill careful to preſerve and defend their own Privileges; and in caſe the Pope ſhould then have challenged that Power over them, which he hath done ſince, no doubt they would not have ſtuck at calling ſuch Incroachments *The Diſeaſe of the Church*, (without any Unhandſomeneſs or Incivility) and would have been far from looking on him as the only Phyſician of it.

To that Pretence, *That Things ſhould have been born with, till the Time of a General Council*, his Lordſhip anſwers: *Firſt, 'tis true, a General Council, free and entire, would have been the beſt Remedy, and moſt able for a Gangrene that had ſpread ſo far, and eaten ſo deep into Chriſtianity, But what? ſhould we have ſuffered this Gangrene to endanger Life and all, rather than be cured in Time by a Phyſician of weaker Knowledge, and a leſs able Hand? Secondly, we live to ſee ſince, if we had ſtayed and expected a General Council, what manner of one we ſhould have had if any. For that at* Trent *was neither General nor free. And for the Errors which* Rome *had contracted, it confirmed them, it cured them not. And yet I much doubt, whether ever that Council ſuch as it was) would have been call'd, if ſome Provincial and National Synods under Supreme and Regal Power, had not firſt ſet upon this great Work of Reformation; which I heartily wish had been as orderly and happily purſued, as the Work was right Chriſtian and good in it ſelf. But humane Frailty and the Heats and Diſtempers of Men, as well as the Cunning of the Devil would not ſuffer that. For even in this Senſe alſo the Wrath of Man doth not accomplish the Will of God, S.*James 1. 20. *but I have learnt not to reject the good which God hath wrought, for any Evil which Men may faſten upon it.* Now to this you anſwer, 1. By a fair Conceſſion again, *that a Provincial Council is the next Chirurgeon, when a Gangrene endangers Life, but ſtill the Pope's Aſſiſtance is required:* For fear the Chirurgeon ſhould do too much good of himſelf, you would be ſure to have the Pope as Phyſician to ſtand by, whom you know too much concerned in the Maladies of the Church, to give way to an effectual Cure. 2. But you ſay further, *That the moſt proper Expedient is an Oecumenical Council*; and this you ſpoil again, with ſaying; *Such as the Council of* Trent *was.* For what you ſay in Vindication of that being *General and free*, we ſhall conſider in the Chapter deſigned for that purpoſe. What you object againſt our National Synod 1562. will be fully anſwered before the end of this; which that we may make way for, we muſt proceed to the Remainder of theſe general Grounds, in which his Lordſhip proves, *That when the Univerſal Church will not, or for the Iniquity of the Times cannot, obtain and ſettle a free General Council, 'tis lawful, nay ſometimes neceſſary to reform groſs Abuſes by a National or a Provincial.* To this you anſwer in General, *That you deny not but Matters of leſs moment as concerning Rites and Ceremonies, Abuſes in Manners and Diſcipline, may be reformed by particular Councils, without expreſs Leave of the Pope; but that in matters of great moment concerning the Faith and publick Doctrine of the Church, Sacraments, and whatever elſe is of Divine Inſtitution, or univerſal Obligation, particular Councils (if they duly proceed) attempt nothing without recourſe to the See Apoſtolick, and the Pope's Conſent either expreſly granted or juſtly preſumed.* Fair Hopes then there are of a Cure, when the Impoſthume gathers in the Head! we are indeed by this put into a very good Condi-

§. 10.
P. 152. n. 4.
P. 165.
P. 152. n. 5.
P. 166. n. 8.

tion; for if a ſmall matter hurts a Church, ſhe hath her Hands at liberty to help her ſelf; but if one comes to raviſh her, her Hands are tyed, and by no means muſt ſhe defend her ſelf. For in caſe, ſay you, it be *any matter of great moment, it muſt be left to the Pope, and nothing to be done without his Conſent*; no not although the main of the Diſtempers come through him. But thanks be to God, our Church is not committed to the Hands of ſuch a mercileſs Phyſician, who firſt cauſeth the Malady, and then forbids the Cure; we know of no ſuch Obligation we have, to ſleep in S. *Peter*'s Church, as of old they did in the Temple of *Æſculapius* in hopes of a Cure. God hath entruſted every National Church with the care of her own Safety, and will require of her an account of that Power he hath given to that end. It will be little Comfort to a Church whoſe Members Rot for want of a Remedy, to ſay, *The Pope will not give leave* or elſe it might have been cured. I wonder where it is that any Chriſtian Church is commanded to wait the Pope's good Leaſure for reforming her ſelf? Whence doth he derive this Authority and ſole Power of reforming Churches? But that muſt be afterwards examined. But is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe that there ſhould be Chriſtian Magiſtrates, and Chriſtian Biſhops in Churches, and yet theſe ſo tyed up, that they can do nothing in order to the Church's Recovery, though the Diſtempers be never ſo great and dangerous? Do we not read in the Apoſtolical Churches, that the Government of them was in themſelves, without any the leaſt mention of any Oecumenical Paſtor over all? If any Abuſes were among them, the particular Governours of thoſe Churches are checked and rebuked for it, and commanded to exerciſe their Power over Offenders? And muſt the Encroachments of an uſurped and arbitrary Power in the Church, hinder particular Churches from the exerciſe of that full power which is committed to the Governours of them? Neither is this only a Right granted to a Church as ſuch, but we find this Power practiſed and aſſerted in the Hiſtory of the Chriſtian Churches from the Apoſtles Times. For no ſooner did the Biſhops of *Rome* begin to encroach, but other Biſhops were ſo mindful of their own Privileges and the Intereſt of their Churches, that they did not yield themſelves his Vaſſals, but diſputed their Rights, and withſtood his Uſurpations. As hath partly appeared already, and will do more afterwards.

§. 11. And that particular Churches may reform themſelves, his Lordſhip produceth ſeveral Teſtimonies; The firſt is of *Gerſon*, who tells us plainly,

P. 153. *That he will not deny, but that the Church may be reformed by Parts. And that this is neceſſary; and, that to effect it, Provincial Councils may ſuffice, and in ſome Things Dioceſan.* And again, *Either you ſhould reform all Eſtates of the Church in a General Council, or command them to be reformed in Provin-*

P. 167. *cial Councils: But all this*, you ſay, *doth not concern Matters of Faith, but only perſonal Abuſes*; But I pray what ground is there that one ſhould be reformed and not the other? Is it not the Reaſon why any Reformation is neceſſary, that the Church's Purity and Safety ſhould be preſerved? And is not that as much or more endangered by erroneous Doctrines than by perſonal Abuſes? Will not then the Parity of Reaſon hold proportionably for one as well as the other? That if the Church may be reformed by Parts as to leſſer Abuſes, then much more certainly as to greater. *Beſides*, you ſay, *Gerſon allowed no Schiſmatical Reformations againſt the Churches Head:* neither do we plead for any ſuch; but then you muſt ſhew, Who the Church's Head is, and, By what Right he comes to be ſo; otherwiſe the cauſe of the Schiſm will fall upon him who pretends to be the Head to direct others, and is as corrupt a Member as any in the Body. But his Lordſhip

ſhip adds, *This right of Provincial Synods, that they might decree in Cauſes of Faith, and in Caſes of Reformation, where Corruptions had crept into the Sacraments of Chriſt, was practiſed much above a thouſand Years ago by many, both National and Provincial Synods.* For which he firſt inſtanceth in the *Council at* Rome *under Pope* Sylveſter *An.* 324. *condemning* Photinus *and* Sabellius, *whoſe Hereſies were of a high Nature againſt the Faith*; but here you ſay, *the very Title confutes his Pretence, for it was held under the Pope and therefore not againſt him.* But however, whether with the *Pope* or againſt him, it was no more than a Provincial Synod; and this decreed ſomething in matters of Faith, though according to your own Doctrine the Pope could not be Infallible there: For you reſtrain his *Infallibility* to a General *Council*, and do not aſſert that it belongs to the particular Church of *Rome.* As well then may any other Provincial *Synod* determine matters of Faith, as that of *Rome*, ſince that hath no more Infallibility belonging to it as ſuch than any other particular *Church* hath; and the Pope himſelf you ſay may err when he doth not define Matters of Faith in a *General Council.* To his Lordſhip's ſecond Inſtance of the Council *of* Gangra *about the ſame time condemning* Euſtathius *for his condemning Marriage as unlawful*; you anſwer to the ſame purpoſe, *That* Oſius *was there, Pope* Sylveſter's *Legate*; but what then? If the Pope had been there himſelf he had not been Infallible, much leſs certainly his *Legate*, who could have only a *Second-hand Infallibility.* To the third of the Council *of* Carthage, *condemning Rebaptization about* 348. you grant, *That it was aſſembled by* Gratus *Biſhop of* Carthage, *but that no new Article was defined in it, but only the perpetual Tradition of the* Church *was confirmed therein.* Neither do we plead for any Power in *Provincial Councils* to define any *new Articles of Faith*, but only to revive the old, and to confirm them in oppoſition to any *Innovations* in point of Doctrine; and as to this we profeſs to be guided by the ſenſe of *Scripture* as interpreted by the unanimous conſent of the *Fathers* and the *four firſt General Councils.* To the fourth of the *Council of* Aquileia, *A. D.* 381. *condemning* Palladius *and* Secundinus *for embracing the Arrian Hereſie, St.* Ambroſe *being preſent*; you anſwer, *That they only condemned thoſe who had been condemned already by the* Nicene *Council; and, St.* Ambroſe *and other Biſhops of* Italy *being preſent, Who can doubt but every thing was done there by the Pope's Authority and Conſent?* But if they only enforced the Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, What need of the Pope's Authority to do that? And do you think that there were no *Provincial Councils* in that part of *Italy* which was particularly diſtinguiſhed from the *ſuburbicarian Churches* under the *Biſhop of Rome*, wherein the *Pope* was not preſent either by himſelf or Legates? If you think ſo, your Thoughts have more of your *Will* than *Underſtanding* in them. But if this Council proceeded according to that of *Nice*, Will it not be as lawful for other Provincial Councils to reform particular Churches, as long as they keep to the Decrees not barely of *Nice*, but of the four *General Councils*, which the *Church* of *England* looks on as her Duty to do? In the two following Inſtances of the ſecond *Council of* Carthage, *declaring in behalf of the Trinity, and the Milevitan Council about the Pelagian Hereſie*; you ſay, *The Biſhops of* Rome *were conſulted:* But what then? Were they conſulted as the *Heads* of the *Church*, or only as eminent *Members* of it in regard of their Faith and Piety? Prove the former when you are able, and as to the latter it depends upon the continuance of that Faith and Piety in them; and when once the reaſon is taken away, there can be no Neceſſity of continuing the ſame reſort. The ſame anſwer will ſerve for what you ſay

Ibid.

Ibid.

concerning the ſecond *Council of Aurange, determining the Controverſies about Grace and Free-will*, ſuppoſing we grant it aſſembled by the means of *Felix* 4. *Biſhop of* Rome; as likewiſe to the *third of Toledo*. We come
P. 154. therefore to that which you call *his Lordſhip's reſerve, and Maſter-Allegation, the fourth Council of* Toledo; which, ſaith he, *did not only handle Matters of Faith for the Reformation of that People, but even added alſo ſomething to the Creed, which were not expreſly delivered in former Creeds. Nay, the Biſhops did not only practiſe this, to condemn Hereſies in National and Provincial Synods, and ſo to reform thoſe ſeveral Places and the Church it ſelf by Parts; but they did openly challenge this as their Right and Due, and that without any*
Concil. Tolet. 4. *Can.* 3. *leave asked of the See of* Rome. *For in this fourth Council of* Toledo *they decree, that, If there happen a cauſe of Faith to be ſettled, a General that is a National Synod of all* Spain *and* Gallicia *ſhall be held thereon. And this in the Year* 643. *where you ſee it was then Catholick Doctrine in all* Spain, *that a National Synod might be a competent Judge in a cauſe of Faith.* But here
P. 168. ſtill we meet with the ſame Anſwer, *That all this might be done with a due Subordination to the See Apoſtolick, but that it doth not hence follow that any thing may be done in Provincial Councils againſt the Authority of it.* Neither do we plead that any thing may be done againſt the juſt Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other Biſhop; but then you muſt prove, that he had a juſt Authority over the Church of *England*, and that he exerciſed no Power here at the Reformation but what did of right belong to him. But the fuller debate of theſe Things muſt be left to that place where you deſignedly aſſert and vindicate the Pope's Authority.

§. 12. Theſe Things being thus in the general cleared, we come to the particular Application of them to the caſe of the Church of *England*. As to
Ibid. which, his Lordſhip ſays; *And if this were practiſed ſo often and in ſo many Places, Why may not a National Council of the Church of* England *do the like, as ſhe did? For ſhe caſt off the Pope's Uſurpation, and as much as in her lay reſtored the King to his right. That appears by a Book ſubſcribed by the Biſhops*
P. 155. *in* Henry *the Eighth's Time. And by the Records in the Archbiſhops Office,*
The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Man. *A.* 1534. *In Synodo Londin. Seſſ* 8. *die Veneris Jan. Ann.* 1562. *orderly kept and to be ſeen. In the Reformation which came after, our Princes had their Parts, and the Clergy theirs. And to theſe two principally the Power and Direction for Reformation belongs. That our Princes had their Parts, is manifeſt by their calling together of the Biſhops, and others of the Clergy, to conſider of that which might ſeem worthy Reformation. And the Clergy did their part; for, being thus called together by Regal Power, they met in the National Synod of ſixty two. And the Articles there agreed on were afterwards confirmed by Acts of State, and the Royal Aſſent. In this Synod, the Poſitive Truths which are delivered are more than the Polemicks. So that a meer Calumny it is, that we profeſs only a Negative Religion. True it is, and we muſt thank* Rome *for it, our Confeſſion muſt needs contain ſome Negatives. For we cannot but deny that Images are to be adored. Nor can we admit maimed Sacraments. Nor grant Prayers in an unknown Tongue. And in a corrupt Time or Place, 'tis as neceſſary in Religion to deny Falſhood, as to aſſert and vindicate Truth. Indeed this latter can hardly be well and ſufficiently done but by the former, an Affirmative Verity being ever included in the Negative to a Falſhood. As for any Error which might fall into this (as any other Reformation) if any ſuch can be found; then I ſay, and 'tis moſt true, Reformation, eſpecially in caſes of Religion, is ſo difficult a Work, and ſubject to ſo many Pretenſions, that 'tis almoſt impoſſible but the Reformers ſhould ſtep too far, or fall too ſhort in ſome ſmaller Things or other, which in regard of the far greater Benefit coming by the Reformation it ſelf, may well be paſſed over and born with-*

withall. But if there have been any wilful and groſs Errors, not ſo much in Opinion as in Fact (Sacrilege too often pretending to Reform Superſtition) that's the Crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation; and they are long ſince gone to God to anſwer it, to whom I leave them.

This is his Lordſhip's full and juſt Account of the Proceedings of the Reformation in the Church of *England*, to which we muſt conſider what Anſwer you return. To his Lordſhip's Queſtion, Why may not a National Council of the Church of *England* do the like? You give this Anſwer, *Truly I know no Reaſon why it may not, provided it be a true National Council and a true Church of* England, *(as thoſe recited were true Churches and Councils) and provided alſo that it do no more.* We are contented to put the Iſſue of this Buſineſs upon theſe three Things, *viz.* That our Church is a true Church, That the Power which reformed it was ſufficient for that purpoſe, and, That no more was done by them than was in their Power to do. But for the firſt you tell us, *That ſeeing by the Church of* England *he means the preſent Proteſtant Church there, you muſt crave Leave of his Lordſhip to deny his Suppoſition, and tell him the Church of* England *in that Senſe, ſignifies no true Church.* Were it not an eaſie matter to requite you by telling you, It is impoſſible we ſhould be guilty of Schiſm in any Separation from your Communion, becauſe we muſt crave leave of you to ſay, that the Church of *Rome* is no true Church; and where there is Schiſm, that muſt be a true Church which Men are guilty of it in ſeparating from. Not as though I ſought only to return a Blow on you which I could not defend our Church from; but to let you ſee, that by whatever way you would prove your Church to be true, by the ſame we may prove ours to be ſo too. If you own and believe the Chriſtian Doctrine to be the way to Salvation, ſo do we. If you embrace the ancient Creeds, ſo do we. If you acknowledge the Scriptures to be God's Word, ſo do we. If you join together in Participation of the Sacraments of Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, ſo do we. If you have a conſtant Succeſſion of Biſhops, ſo have we. Name then what it is, which is Fundamental to the Being of a Church, which our Proteſtant Church doth want? You grant the *Church of* England *was a true Church* before the Reformation, wherein was it altered from it ſelf by it, that it ceaſed to be a true Church? Was it, in denying the Pope's Supremacy in *Henry the eighth*'s Time? That cannot be; for you very remarkably grant afterwards, *That the Biſhops, and the King too, left the Pope in Poſſeſſion of all that he could rightly challenge.* (Which is a Conceſſion we ſhall make more uſe of afterwards.) Surely then this could not unchurch them. Or, Was it the Proceedings of the Reformation in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time? The Supremacy could not be it neither now; for that was aſſerted under a more moderate Title in her Time, than in her Father's. Was it the Uſe of the Liturgy in the *Engliſh* Tongue? Surely not, when *Pius the Fourth* offered to confirm it, as is credibly reported from *Vincentius Parpalia*, whom that Pope imployed on a Meſſage to Queen *Elizabeth*, with Terms of Accommodation. But, what was it which did unchurch us? Were they the Articles of Religion agreed on in the Convocation, 1562? If they were theſe, were they either the poſitive or negative Articles? If the poſitive, were they the aſſerting the Articles contained in the three Creeds, the Sufficiency of Scriptures, the neceſſity of Divine Grace? or, What elſe? If the negative, Was it the denying *Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Unlawfulneſs of Prieſts Marriage, Communion in one kind?* or, Which of them elſe was it, which made the Proteſtant Church to be no true Church? Or, Is it laſtly the aſſerting, *That as the Church of* Jeruſalem, Alexandria, *and* Antioch, *have erred, ſo alſo the Church*

P. 168. n. 9

Ibid.

P. 169

Art. 1[illegible]

Church of Rome *hath erred, not only in their Livings, and manner of Ceremonies, but alſo in Matters of Faith?* Is this it which hath done us all the Miſchief to unchurch us, *viz.* the denying your Church's Infallibility? If this be it, it is our Comfort yet, that our Church will remain a true Church, till yours be proved to be Infallible; which I dare ſay, will be long enough. But, as though it were in your abſolute Power to Church and Unchurch whom, and when you pleaſe, you offer at no Proof at all of this Aſſertion, but only very fairly *crave his Lordſhip's leave to call the Proteſtant Church no true Church:* Which indeed is a more civil way of begging the Queſtion. And if it will not be granted, you cannot help it; for you have done your utmoſt, in *craving his leave* for it, and you have no more to ſay to it.

Q. 13. But, you ſeem to ſay much more to the ſecond, *That the Reformation was not managed by a lawful Power, nor carried on in a due manner*; for you offer to prove, that the *National Synod* 1562, *was no lawful Synod*, in theſe Words. *For is it not notorious, that that pretended Synod*, A. D. 1562. *were*
P. 168, 169. *all manifeſt Uſurpers? Is it not manifeſt, that they all by Force intruded themſelves, both into the Sees of other lawful Biſhops, and into the Cures of other lawful Paſtors, quietly and Canonically poſſeſſed of them before the ſaid Intruſion? Can thoſe be accounted a lawful National Council of* England, *or lawfully to repreſent the Engliſh Church, who never had any lawful, that is, Canonical and juſt Vocation, Miſſion, or Juriſdiction given them to, and over the Engliſh Nation?* Two Things you object as the great Reaſons why thoſe Perſons who ſate in the Convocation, *A.* 1562. could make no lawful Synod, and thoſe are Intruſion, and want of a lawful Miſſion, which ſhall be particularly examined. The firſt Charge is of Intruſion, which you would ſeem to aggravate by ſeveral Circumſtances, *that they intruded themſelves*, and that *by Force*; and not ſome, but *all*; and that *into the Sees of other lawful Biſhops, and Cures of lawful Paſtors*. But how true theſe Circumſtances are, muſt appear by a true Account of the Matters of Fact relating to theſe Things in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign. How falſe that is, That *all intruded themſelves*, is notorious to any one who underſtands any thing of thoſe Times: For this Convocation was held in the fifth Year of Queen *Elizabeth*. And in the firſt of her Reign, of 26 Cathedral Churches, there were but fourteen or fifteen Biſhops then living in *England*. For the Sees of *Salisbury* and *Oxford* fell vacant *A.* 1557. and were not ſupplied in the time of Queen *Mary*. *Hereford, Briſtow, Bangor*, were vacant by the Death of the ſeveral Biſhops, ſome Weeks before Queen *Mary*. *Canterbury* by the death of Cardinal *Pool*, the ſame Day with the Queen. *Norwich* and *Glouceſter* a few Weeks after her; and ſo likewiſe *Rocheſter, Worceſter*, and S. *Aſaph* became vacant by the voluntary Exile of *Pates* and *Goldwell*, the Biſhops thereof; ſo that but fifteen Biſhops were then living and remaining in *England*. And, were all thoſe who ſupplied theſe vacant Sees, Intruders? A ſtrange kind of Intruſion into dead Mens Places! So then, this Circumſtance is notoriouſly falſe, *That they All by force intruded themſelves into the Sees of other Lawful Biſhops*. But let us ſee, Whether the other are more juſtly charged with a forcible Intruſion into the Sees of the other Biſhops. For which we muſt conſider what the Proceedings were in Reference to them: It appears then, that in the firſt Year of the Queen, the Oath of Supremacy, formed and enjoined in the time of *Henry* 8. was in the firſt Parliament of Queen *Elizabeth*, revived for the better ſecuring the Queen of the Fidelity of her Subjects; but yet it was ſo revived, that ſeveral conſiderable Paſſages in the Act concerning it, were upon mature Deliberation mitigated, both as to the Queen's Title,

which

which was not *Supreme Head*, but Supreme Governour; a Title which *Queen Mary* had used before, as appears by an Act passed in the third Session of Parliament in her time: and likewise as to the penalty; for, whereas the *Stat.* 28. *Hen.* 8. *c.* 10. was so very severe, *That whosoever did extol the Authority of the Bishop of* Rome, *was, for the first Offence, within the compass of a* Præmunire, *and for refusing to take the Oath, was guilty of Treason*; it passed now in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time, only with this penalty, *That such who refused it, should be excluded such Places of Honour and Profit, as they held in the Church or Common-wealth; and that such as should maintain or defend the Authority, Preheminence, Power, or Jurisdiction, Spiritual or Ecclesiastical, of any foreign Prince, Prelate, Person, State or Potentate whatsoever, should be three times convicted before he suffered the Pains of Death.* Upon the expiring of the *Parliament*, *Commissioners* were appointed to require the *Bishops* to take the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, according to the Law made to that purpose, which being tendred to them, they all (*Kitchin* of *Landaffe* only excepted) unanimously refused it, although they had taken it before as *Priests* or *Bishops*, in the Reign of *Henry* 8. or *Edward* 6. But whether by some secret Intimations from *Rome*, or their own Obstinacy, they were resolved rather to undergo the Penalty of the *Law*, than to take it now; and accordingly before the end of that Year, they were deprived of their *Bishopricks*. So that the Question about the *Intrusion* of those *Bishops*, who came into their *Sees*, depends upon the *Legality* of the *deprivation* of these. And certainly, whosoever considers their former Carriage towards the *Queen*, in refusing to assist at her *Coronation*, and some of them threatning to excommunicate her instead of disputing at *Westminster*, as they had solemnly engaged to do, joyned with this Contumacy in refusing the *Oath*, will find that these Persons did not unjustly suffer this *deprivation*. For which I need not run out into the *Princes* Power over *Ecclesiastical Persons*; for you have given a sufficient Reason for it your self in that Acknowledgment of yours, *That the Bishops, and the King too*, (meaning King *Henry*) *left the Pope in possession of all he could rightly challenge*. If this be true, that notwithstanding the *Stat.* 28. *Hen.* 8. notwithstanding the Oath of *Supremacy* then taken, the *Pope* might enjoy all that belonged to him of *Divine Right*, he might then do the same, notwithstanding this Oath in *Queen Elizabeth*'s time, which was only reviving the former with some mitigation; and what could it be then else but Obstinacy and Contumacy in them to refuse it? And therefore the Plea which you make for those whom you call the *Henry Bishops*, will sufficiently condemn these present *Bishops*, whom we now speak of. For if those Bishops only renounced the *Popes Canonical and acquired Jurisdiction here in* England, as you say, *i. e. That Authority and Jurisdiction in Ecclesiastical Matters, which the Pope exercised here by virtue of the Canons, Prescription, and other Titles of humane right, and gave it to the King; yet they never renounced or deprived him of that part of his Authority, which is far more intrinsecal to his Office, and of Divine Right; they never denied the Popes Soveraign Power to teach the Universal Church, and determine all Controversies of Faith whatsoever in a General Council.* If these things, I say, be true, which you confidently assert, the more inexcusable were these *Bishops* for refusing that Oath of *Supremacy* which they had not only taken in *King Henry*'s time, but which, by your own Confession, takes away nothing of the *Pope's Authority, in relation to the whole Catholick Church.* And by this means their Obstinacy appeared so great, as might justly deserve a deprivation. It being certainly in the Power of the *King* and *Bishops* to assert their own rights,

White and *Watson.*

in

in Oppofition to any Canons or Preſcriptions whatſoever of meerly humane Right. So that by your own Confeſſion, the more excuſable the *Henry-Biſhops* were, as you call them, the leſs excuſable the *Mary Biſhops* were (as, to follow you, we muſt call them) in refuſing the Oath of Supremacy, when tendred to them. Was it lawful then in King *Henry*'s time, to take this Oath or not? If not, then King *Henry*'s Biſhops are infinitely to blame for taking it, and you for defending them: If it was lawful then, why not in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time? Had ſhe not as much Reaſon to impoſe it as her Father? Had ſhe not as much Power to do it? When one of the chief Refuſers, *Heath*, Arch-Biſhop of *York*, and then Lord Chancellor of *England*, did, upon the firſt Notice of the Death of Queen *Mary*, declare to the Houſe of Commons, *That the Succeſſion of the Crown did of Right belong to the Princeſs* Elizabeth, *whoſe Title they conceived to be free from all legal Queſtions*; this could be then no Plea at all for them. So that if any Perſons through the greateſt Obſtinacy, might be deprived by a Prince of their Eccleſiaſtical Preferments, theſe might; and when you can prove, that in no caſe a Prince hath Power to deprive Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, you will ſay more to your purpoſe than yet you have done. But till you have done that, it remains clear, that theſe Biſhops were juſtly deprived; and if ſo, What was to be done with their vacant Sees? Muſt they be kept vacant ſtill? Or ſuch be put into them who were guilty of the ſame Fault with themſelves, in refuſing the Oath, when tendred to them? If not ſuch, then it was neceſſary that other fit Perſons ſhould be legally conſecrated and inveſted in them: And ſo they were, the Places being ſupplied by Worthy Perſons; the Arch-biſhop of *Canterbury* being conſecrated by a Canonical Number of *Edward-Biſhops*, and the reſt duly conſecrated by other Hands. And for all this, *Muſt all theſe Perſons be Intruders, and intrude themſelves by force, and that into the Places of other lawful Biſhops?* When ſo many Sees were actually vacant, and the reſt by due form of Law, into which other Biſhops were elected, and legally conſecrated, notwithſtanding the putid Fable of the *Nags-Head* Ordination, which hath ſo often and ſo evidently been diſproved, that I am glad to find you have ſo much Modeſty, as not to mention it. Theſe Biſhops being thus legally inveſted in their Places, To whom did the Care and Government of the *Engliſh* Church belong? To theſe, or to thoſe who were juſtly deprived? If to theſe, Were not they then the due Repreſentatives of the *Engliſh* Church in a National Synod, who with thoſe of the lower Houſe of Convocation, make up a true National Council? And if ſo, it belonged to them as ſuch, to conſider what appertained to the Faith and Government of the Church of *England*. For they undertook not to preſcribe to the whole World, that they leave to the Biſhop and Church of *Rome* (not as legally belonging to them, but arrogantly uſurped by them) but to draw up *Articles of Religion*, which ſhould be owned by all ſuch who enjoyed any Place of Truſt in the Church of *England*. So that in all this they were neither Intruders, neither did they act any thing beyond their Place and Authority. But you would ſeem to quarrel *with their Vocation, Miſſion, and Juriſdiction, as though it were not lawful*, i. e. *Canonical and Juſt*; all theſe are your own Words, and they are but Words; for not one Syllable like a Proof is ſuggeſted. I tell you then (not to ſpend Time in a needleſs Vindication of the Vocation of the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Church of *England*, when you give us no Reaſon to queſtion it) that by the ſame Arguments that you can prove that you have any lawful Biſhops and Paſtors in your Church, it will appear that

we

we have too. And that our Vocation and Miſſion is far more conſonant to the *Apoſtolical* and *Primitive Church* than yours is.

But, the main Quarrel is ſtill behind, which is, that *Suppoſing they had been true Biſhops, and Paſtors of the* Engliſh *Church, and their Aſſembly a lawful National Council, yet,* you ſay, *They were ſo far from doing the like (that other Provincial Councils had done) that they acted directly contrary to them, which Charge lies in theſe Things.* 1. *Condemning Points of Faith that had been generally believed and practiſed in the Church before them.* This you know we deny, and you barely affirm it, and I have ſhewed ſome Reaſon of our denial already, and ſhall do more when we come to Particulars. 2. *In contradicting the Doctrine of the* Roman *Church:* A great Hereſie indeed, but never yet condemned in any *General Council.* 3. *In convening againſt the Expreſs Will of the Church of* Rome: We ſhall then think that a Fault, when you prove it belongs to that only, to ſummon all Councils, *General, National,* and *Provincial.* 4. *In denying the Pope's Authority, or attempting to deprive him of it:* if you ſpeak of his uſurped *Authority* you muſt prove it a Fault to deprive him of it, *i. e.* to withdraw our ſelves from Obedience to it, for that is all the Deprivation can be here underſtood. If you mean *Juſt Authority* ſhew wherein it lies, whence he had it, by what means he came into it in the *Church* of *England*; and if you can make it appear that he had a juſt Claim, it will be eaſie proving them guilty of a Fault who diſowned it. But, Whether it were a *Fault* in them or no, I am ſure it is *one* in you, to lay ſuch Things, and ſo many to our *Charge*, and not offering to give Evidence for one of them. But I muſt conſider the Infallibility of you *Church* lies in *dictating*, and not *proving*. Thus then, for any thing which you ſo much as ſeem to ſay to the contrary, the Proceedings of the *Reformation* were very regular and juſt, being built on ſufficient Grounds, managed in a legal manner, and carried on with due Moderation, which are the higheſt Commendations can be given to a Work of *Reformation*; and do with the greateſt Right belong to the *Church* of *England*, of any *Church* in the Chriſtian World. There remains nothing now, which you object againſt our *Reformation*, but ſome Faults of the *Reformers*; as to which his Lordſhip had already ſaid, *If any ſuch be found, they are the Crimes of the Perſons, and not of the Reformation, and they are long ſince gone to God to anſwer it, to whom I leave them.* Which Anſwer ſo full of Juſtice and Modeſty, one would have thought, ſhould have been ſufficient for any reaſonable Man; but you are not ſatisfied with it. *For you will have thoſe Faults to come from the Principles of the Reformation, and that they did not belong to the Perſons of the Reformers, but are entailed on their Succeſſors.* But a ſhort Anſwer will ſuffice for both theſe: Shew us, What avowed Principles o the *Church* of *England* tend to any real *Sacrilege*, before you charge any thing of that Nature, as flowing from the *Maxims* of the *Reformation.* And if you can prove the *Succeſſors* of the *Reformers* to continue in any *Sacrilegious Actions*, let thoſe plead for them who will, I ſhall not; but leave them, as his Lordſhip did, *to anſwer ſuch Things to God.*

p. 14. P. 196.

P. 172.

As to the *Memorandum*, which his Lordſhip concludes this Diſcourſe with, *That he ſpake at that Time of the General Church, as it was for the moſt part forced under the Government of the* Roman *See, not doubting, but that as the Univerſal Catholick Church would have reformed her ſelf; had ſhe been in all Parts freed of the* Roman *Yoke; ſo, while ſhe was for the moſt in theſe Weſtern Parts under that Yoke, the Church of* Rome *was, if not the only, yet the chief Hinderance of Reformation:* You anſwer with ſome Stomach; *By what Force I pray? Is it poſſible? or, Can it enter into the Judgment of any reaſonable*

P. 156. n. 6.

Man, that a ſingle Biſhop, of no very large Dioceſe, ſhould be able by force, to bring into Subjection ſo many large Provinces of Chriſtendom, *as confeſſedly did acknowledge the Pope's Power, when the pretended Reformation began?* But, what reaſonable Man can imagine, that a *ſingle Biſhop*, indeed of no very large *Dioceſe* (if kept within his Bounds) ſhould, in Progreſs of Time, extend his *Power* ſo far as the *Pope* did, but by one of theſe two Means, *Force*, or *Fraud?* And ſince you ſeem to be ſo much diſpleaſed at the *former*, I pray take the *latter*; or rather, the Conjunction of both together. For that there was *Force* uſed, appears by the manifold Reſiſtance which was made to the Encroachments of the *Pope's* Power; and the ſad *Complaints* of the *Uſurpations* and *Abuſes* which were in it; and theſe abundantly delivered *by Claſſical Authors of both the preſent and precedent Times:* and (to uſe more of your own Words) *all Eccleſiaſtical Monuments are full of them*; ſo that this is *no falſe Calumny, or bitter Paſquil* (as you call it) but a very plain and evident Truth. But that there was likewiſe a great deal of Art, Subilty and Fraud uſed in the getting, keeping, and managing the *Pope's* Power, he hath but a ſmall *Meaſure* of *Wit* who doth not *underſtand*, and they as little of *Honeſty*, who dare not confeſs it.

CHAP. V.

Of the *Roman* Churches Authority.

The Queſtion concerning the Church *of* Rome's *Authority entred upon. How far our Church, in reforming her ſelf, condemns the Church of* Rome. *The Pope's Equality with other Patriarchs, aſſerted. The Arabick Canons of the Nicene Council proved to be Suppoſititious. The Polity of the Ancient Church diſcovered from the ſixth Canon of the Council of* Nice. *The Rights of Primates and Metropolitans ſettled by it. The ſuitableneſs of the Eccleſiaſtical to the Civil Government. That the Biſhop of* Rome *had then a limited Juriſdiction within the Suburbicary Churches; as Primate of the* Roman *Dioceſe. Of the* Cyprian *Privilege; that it was not peculiar, but common to all Primates of Dioceſes. Of the Pope's Primacy according to the Canons; how far pertinent to our Diſpute. How far the Pope's Confirmation requiſite to new elected Patriarchs. Of the Synodical and Communicatory Letters. The Teſtimonies of* Petrus de Marcâ *concerning the Pope's Power of confirming and depoſing Biſhops. The Inſtances brought for it, conſidered. The caſe of* Athanaſius *being reſtored by* Julius, *truly ſtated. The Proceedings of* Conſtantine *in the caſe of the Donatiſts cleared, and the Evidence thence againſt the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Appeals of Biſhops to* Rome, *how far allowed by the Canons of the Church. The great Caſe of Appeals between the* Roman *and* African *Biſhops diſcuſſed. That the Appeals of Biſhops were prohibited, as well as thoſe of the inferiour Clergy.* T. C.'s *Fraud in citing the Epiſtle of the* African *Biſhops, for acknowledging Appeals to* Rome. *The contrary manifeſted from the ſame Epiſtle to* Boniface, *and the other to* Cœleſtine. *The Exemption of the Ancient Britannick Church from any Subjection to the See of* Rome, *aſſerted. The caſe of* Wilfrid's *Appeal anſwered. The Primacy of* England *not derived from* Gregory's *Grant to* Auguſtin *the Monk. The Ancient Primacy of the Britannick Church not loſt upon the* Saxon *Converſion. Of the State of the* African *Churches, after their denying Appeals to* Rome. *The riſe of the Pope's Greatneſs under Chriſtian*

Chriſtian Emperors. Of the Decree of the Sardican *Synod, in caſe of Appeals: Whether ever received by the Church: No Evidence thence of the Pope's Supremacy.* Zoſimus *his Forgery in ſending the* Sardican *Canons inſtead of the* Nicene. *The weakneſs of the Pleas for it, manifeſted.*

§. 1. THat which now remains to be diſcuſſed in the *Queſtion* of *Schiſm*, is, concerning the Authority of the *Church* and *Biſhop* of *Rome*, Whether that be ſo large and extenſive, as to bind us to an univerſal Submiſſion, ſo that by renouncing of it, we violate the *Unity* of the *Church*, and are thereby guilty of *Schiſm*? But, before we come to a particular Diſcuſſion of that, we muſt caſt our Eyes back on the precedent Chapter, in which the Title promiſeth us, *That Proteſtants ſhould be further convinced of Schiſm*; Chap. 14. but upon Examination of it, there appears not ſo much as the Shadow of any new Matter, but it wholly depends upon Principles already refuted, and ſo contains a bare Repetition of what hath been abundantly anſwered in the firſt Part. So your firſt Section hath no more of Strength, than what lies in your *Churches Infallibility*: For, when you would plead, *That though the Church of* Rome *be the accuſed Party, yet ſhe may judge in her own cauſe*; P. 171. 172. you do it upon this ground, *That you had already proved the* Roman *Church to be infallible, and therefore your Church might as well condemn her Accuſers, as the Apoſtles theirs; and that Proteſtants not pretending Infallibility, cannot rationally be permitted to be Accuſers and Witneſſes againſt the* Roman *Church.* Now, what doth all this come to, in caſe your *Church* be not infallible, as we have evidently proved ſhe is not, in the *firſt part*; and that ſhe is ſo far from it, that ſhe hath moſt groſly erred, as we ſhall prove in the *third Part*? Your ſecond Section ſuppoſes the Matter of Fact evident, *That Proteſtants did contradict the publick Doctrine and Belief of all Chriſtians generally throughout the World*, P. 173. which we have lately proved to be an egregious Falſity, and ſhall do more afterwards. The cauſe of the *Separatiſts*, and the *Church* of *England*, is vaſtly different, Whether we look on the Authority, Cauſe, or Manner of their Proceedings; and in your other Inſtances you ſtill beg the Queſtion, *That your Church is our Mother-Church, and therefore we are bound to ſubmit to her Judgment, though ſhe be the accuſed Party.* But as this whole Buſineſs of *Quo Judice*, nothing can be ſpoken with more Solidity and Satisfaction, than what his Lordſhip ſaith. *If it be* P. 157. *a Cauſe common to both, as certain it is here (between the Proteſtant and* Roman *Church) then neither Part alone may be Judge; if neither alone may judge then either they muſt be judged by a third, which ſtands indifferent to both, and that is the Scripture; or if there be a Jealouſie, or a Doubt of the Senſe of the Scripture, they muſt either both repair to the Expoſition of the Primitive Church, and ſubmit to that; or both call and ſubmit to a General Council, which ſhall be lawfully called, and fairly and freely held with Indifferency to all Parties; and that muſt judge the Difference according to Scripture, which muſt be their Rule as well as private Mens.* When you either attempt to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of this, or ſubſtitute any thing more reaſonable inſtead of it, you may expect a further Anſwer to the Queſtion, *Quo Judice*? as far as it concerns the difference between your Church, and ours. The Remainder of this *whole Chapter*, is only a Repetition of ſomewhat concerning *Fundamentals*, and a ad p. 181. further expatiating in Words, without the Addition of any more Strength from Reaſon or Authority *upon the Churches Infallibility being proved from Scripture*; which having been throughly conſidered already, and an account given, not only of the meaning of thoſe Places (one excepted, which we ſhall meet with again) but of the Reaſon, Why the Senſe of them as to In-

Infallibility ſhould be reſtrained to the Apoſtles, I find no ſufficient Motive inducing me to follow you, in diſtruſting the Reader's Memory, and treſpaſſing on his Patience, ſo much as to inculcate the ſame things over and over, as you do. Paſſing by therefore the Things already handled, and leaving the reſt (if any ſuch Thing appear) to a more convenient Place, where theſe very Places of Scripture are again brought upon the Stage in the Queſtions of the Pope's Authority and Infallibility of General Councils, I come to your following Chapter, in which you enter upon the Vindication of the *Roman Churches Authority*.

P. 2. 2. That which his Lordſhip hath long inſiſted on, and evidently proved, is, *The Right which particular Churches have to reform themſelves, when the General Church cannot for Impediments, or will not for Negligence do it.* And your Anſwers to his Proofs have had their Weakneſs ſufficiently laid open; the only thing here objected further, is, *Whether in ſo doing particular Churches do not condemn others of Errors in Faith?* To which his
F. 166. Lordſhip anſwers, *That to reform themſelves, and to condemn others, are two different Works, unleſs it fall out ſo, that by reforming themſelves, they do by Conſequence condemn any other, that is guilty in that Point, in which they reform themſelves; and ſo far to judge and condemn others, is not only lawfull but neceſſary. A Man that lives Religiouſly, doth not by and by ſit in Judgment, and condemn with his Mouth all prophane Livers; but yet while he is ſilent, his very Life condemns them.* To what end his Lordſhip produceth this Inſtance, any one may eaſily underſtand; but you abuſe it, as though his Lordſhip had ſaid, *That Proteſtants only by their Religious Lives do condemn your Church;* and upon this run out into a ſtrange Declamation about
P. 182. n. 1. *Who the Men are that live ſo Religiouſly? They who to propagate the Goſpel the better, marry Wives contrary to the Canons, and bring Scripture for it?* Yes ſurely, much more than they who to propagate your Church, enjoy Concubines; for which if they can bring ſome Canons of your Church, I am ſure they can bring Scripture for it. *They who pull down Monaſteries both of Religious Men and Women?* I ſee, you are ſtill as loth to part them, as they are to be parted themſelves; but if all their Lives be no more Religious than the moſt of them have been; the pulling of them down might be a greater act of Religion than living in them. *They who caſt Altars to the Ground?* More certainly than they who worſhipped them. *They who partly baniſh Prieſts, and partly put them to Death?* Or they who commit Treaſons and do Things worthy of Death? But you are doubtleſs very Religious and tender-hearted Men, whoſe Conſciences would never ſuffer you to baniſh or put any to Death for the ſake of Religion; no not in Queen *Maries* time here in *England*! *They who deface the very Tombs of Saints, and will not permit them to reſt even when they are dead?* Or they who profeſs to Worſhip dead Saints, and martyr living Ones with Fire and Faggot? If this be your Religious Living, none who know what Religion means will be much taken with it. I ſhall eaſily grant that *you ſtick cloſe to the Pope*, but are therein far enough from the Doctrine or Life of S. *Peter*. If any of you *have endured Sequeſtrations, Impriſonments, Death itſelf*, I am ſure it was not for any good you did; not for the Catholick Faith, but if you will, for ſome Catholick Treaſons, ſuch as would have enwrapt a whole Nation in Miſery. If this be *your ſuffering Perſecution for Righteouſneſs ſake*, you will have little Cauſe to rejoice in your Fellow-Sufferers. But if you had not a mind to calumniate us, and provoke us to ſpeak ſad Truths of you, all this might have been ſpared; for his Lordſhip only choſe this Inſtance, to ſhew that a Church or Perſon may be condemned conſequentially, which was not intentionally. But

you

you ſay, *Our Church hath formally condemned yours, by publick and ſolemn Cenſures in the* 39 *Articles.* Doth his Lordſhip deny that our *Church* in order to our own Reformation hath condemned many *Things* which your *Church* holds? No, but that our *Church's* main Intention was to reform it ſelf; but, conſidering the Corruption and Degeneracy of your *Church*, ſhe could not do it, without conſequentially condemning yours: and, that ſhe did juſtly in ſo doing, we are ready on all Occaſions to juſtifie.

But his Lordſhip asks, *If one particular Church may not judge or condemn another, What muſt then be done where Particulars need Reformation?* To which his Adverſary gives a plain Anſwer, *That particular Churches muſt in that Caſe (as* Irenæus *intimateth) have recourſe to the Church of* Rome, *which hath more powerful Principality; and to her Biſhop, who is the chief Paſtor of the whole Church, as being S.* Peter's *Succeſſor*, &c. This is the riſe and occaſion of the preſent Controverſie. To this his Lordſhip Anſwers, *That it is moſt true indeed; the Church of* Rome *hath had, and hath yet, more powerful Principality, than any other particular Church. But ſhe hath not this power from Chriſt. The* Roman *Patriarch by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions might perhaps have a Primacy of Order: but for Principality of Power, the Patriarchs were as even, as equal, as the Apoſtles were before them. The Truth is, this more powerful Principality the* Roman *Biſhops got under the Emperours, after they became Chriſtian; and they uſed the Matter ſo, that they grew big enough to oppoſe, nay, to depoſe the Emperors, by the ſame power which they had given them. And after this, other particular Churches, eſpecially here in the Weſt, ſubmitted themſelves to them for Succour and Protections ſake. And this was one main cauſe that ſwell'd* Rome *into this more powerful Principality, and not any right given by Chriſt to make that Prelate, Paſtor of the whole Church.* To this you Anſwer, *That to ſay that the* Roman *Churches Principality is not from Chriſt, is contrary to St.* Auſtin *and the whole* Milevitan *Council, who in their Epiſtle to* Innocent *the firſt, profeſs that the Popes Authority is grounded upon Scripture, and conſequently proceeds from Chriſt.* But whoever ſeriouſly reads and throughly conſiders that Epiſtle, will find no ſuch thing as that you aim at there. For the ſcope of the Epiſtle is to perſwade *Pope Innocent* to appear againſt *Cœleſtius* and *Pelagius*; to that end they give firſt an Account of their Doctrine, ſhewing how pernicious and contrary to *Scripture* it was; after which they tell him that *Pelagius* being at *Jeruſalem* was like to do a great deal of Miſchief there, but that many of the *Brethren* oppoſed him, and eſpecially St. *Hierom. But we*, ſay they, *do ſuppoſe that through the Mercy of our Lord Chriſt aſſiſting you, thoſe which hold ſuch perverſe and pernicious Principles may more eaſily yield by your Authority drawn out of Scripture.* Where they do not in the leaſt dream of his *Authority* as *Univerſal Paſtor being grounded on Scripture*, but of his appearing againſt the *Pelagians* with his Authority drawn out of *Scripture*, that is, to that Authority which he had in the *Church*, by the Reputation of the *Roman See*, the *Authority* of the *Scripture* being added, which was ſo clear againſt the *Pelagians*, or both theſe going together were the moſt probable way to ſuppreſs their Doctrine. And it hath been ſufficiently proved by others, by very many Inſtances of the Writers about that Age, that *Authoritas* was no more than *Reſcriptum*; as particularly appears by many Paſſages in *Leo*'s Epiſtles, in which ſenſe no more is expeeſſed by this, than that by the *Pope*'s Anſwer to the *Council* drawn out of the *Authority of Scripture*, the *Pelagians* might more probably be ſuppreſſed. But what is this

S. 7. P. 167.

P. 183.

Arbitramur — adjuvante miſericordiâ Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti — Authoritati Sanctitatis tuæ de ſanctarum Scripturarum Authoritate deprompt æ facilius eos qui tam perverſa & pernicioſa ſentiunt, eſſe ceſſuros. Aug. ep 92.

to

to an Univerſal Paſtorſhip given by Chriſt to him; any otherwiſe than to thoſe who ſat in any other Apoſtolical Sees?

But your great Quarrel is againſt his Lordſhip, for making all the Patriarchs even and equal, as to *Principality of Power*: and when he ſaith, *Equal as the Apoſtles were*, you ſay, *that is æquivocal; for though the Apoſtles had equal Juriſdiction over the whole Church, yet St.* Peter *alone had Juriſdiction over the Apoſtles*; but this is neither proved from *John* 21. nor is it at all clear in Antiquity as will appear when we come to that Subject.

§. 4. But this Aſſertion of the *Equality of Patriarchs*, is ſo deſtructive to your Pretenſions in behalf of the *Church of* Rome, that you ſet your ſelf more particularly to diſprove it, which you offer to do by two Things. 1. *By a Canon of the* Nicene *Council.* 2. *By the Practice of the ancient Church.*

P. 184. You begin with the firſt of them, and tell us, *That 'tis contrary to the Council of* Nice, *in the third Canon whereof, which concerns the Juriſdiction of Patriarchs, the Authority (or Principality if you will) of the Biſhop of* Rome *is made the Pattern, and Model of that Authority and Juriſdiction which Patriarchs were to exerciſe over the Provincial Biſhops. The Words of the Canon are theſe.* Sicque præeſt Patriarcha iis omnibus, qui ſub ejus poteſtate ſunt, ſicut ille qui tenet ſedem Romæ, caput eſt & princeps omnium Patriarcharum, *The Patriarch* (ſay they) *is in the ſame manner over all thoſe that are under his Authority, as he who holds the See of* Rome *is Head and Prince of the Patriarchs. And in the ſame Canon the Pope is afterwards ſtyled,* Petro ſimilis & Authoritate par, *reſembling St.* Peter *and his equal in Authority.* Theſe are big Words indeed, and to your Purpoſe, if ever any ſuch thing had been decreed by the *Council* of *Nice*; but I ſhall evidently prove, that this *Canon* is *Suppoſititious*, and a notorious piece of *Forgery.* Which Forgery is much increaſed by you when you tell us, theſe Words are contained in the third *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*: Which in the *Greek* Editions of the Canons by *du Tillet*, and the *Codex Canonum* by *Juſtellus*, and all other extant, in the *Latin* Verſions of *Dionyſius Exiguus*, and *Iſidore Mercator*, is wholly againſt the συνείσακτοι, *i. e.* ſuch kind of *Women* which *Clergymen* took into their Houſes, neither as *Wives* or *Concubines*, but under a Pretext of *Piety.* In the *Arabick Edition* of the *Nicene Canons*, ſet out by *Alphonſus Piſanus*, the third *Canon* is againſt the Ordination either of *Neophyti* or *Criminal Perſons*, and ſo likewiſe in that of *Turrianus*. So that in no Edition, whether *Arabick* or other, is this the third *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*, and therefore you were guilty either of great Ignorance and Negligence in ſaying ſo, or of notorious Fraud and Impoſture, if you knew it to be otherwiſe, and yet ſaid it that the unwary Reader might believe this *Canon* to be within the 20. which are the only genuine *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice.* Indeed ſuch a *Canon* there is in theſe *Arabick Editions*, but it is ſo far from being the third, that in the Editions both of *Piſanus* and *Turrianus* it is the *thirty ninth*, and in it I grant thoſe Words are; but yet you will have little Reaſon to rejoice in them, when I have proved, (as I doubt not to do) that this whole *farrago* of *Arabick Canons* is a meer Forgery; and that I ſhall prove both from the true Number of the *Nicene Canons*, and the Incongruity of many Things in the *Arabick Canons* with the *State* and *Polity* of the *Church* at that time.

In thoſe Editions ſet out by *Piſanus* and *Turrianus*, from the Copy which they ſay was brought by *Baptiſta Romanus* from the *Partriarch* of *Alexandria* there are no fewer than *eighty Canons*; whereas the *Nicene Council* never paſſed above 20. Which if it appear true, that will ſufficiently diſcover the *Forgery* and *Suppoſititiouſneſs* of theſe *Arabick Canons.* Now that there

there were no more than twenty genuine *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*. I thus prove, firſt from *Theodoret*, who after he had given an account of the Proceedings in the *Council* againſt the *Arrians*, he ſaith, *That the Fathers met in Council again, and paſſed twenty Canons relating to the Churches Polity*; and *Gelaſius Cyzicenus*, whom *Alphonſus Piſanus* ſet forth with his *Latin Verſion*, recounts no more than *twenty Canons*; the ſame Number is aſſerted by *Nicephorus Calliſtus*; and we need not trouble our ſelves with reciting the Teſtimonies of more *Greek Authors*, ſince *Binius* himſelf confeſſeth, that all the *Greeks* ſay, there were no more than *twenty Canons* then determined. But although certainly the *Greeks* were the moſt competent Judges in this caſe, yet the *Latins* themſelves did not allow of more. For although *Ruffinus* makes twenty two, yet that is not by the Addition of any more *Canons*, but by ſplitting two into four. And if we believe *Pope Stephen* in *Gratian*, the *Roman Church* did allow of no more than twenty. And in that *Epitome* of the *Canons* which *Pope Hadrian* ſent to *Charles the Great* for the Government of the *Weſtern Churches*, *A. D.* 773. the ſame Number of the *Nicene Canons* appear ſtill. And in a *MS.* of *Hincmarus Rhemenſis*, againſt *Hincmarus Laudunenſis*, this is not only aſſerted, but at large contended for, that there were no more *Canons* determined at *Nice*, than thoſe twenty which we now have, from the Teſtimonies of the *Tripartite Hiſtory*, *Ruffinus*, the *Carthaginian Council*, the Epiſtles of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, and the twelfth Action of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. So that if both *Greeks* and *Latins* ſay true, there could be no more than twenty genuine *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*; which may be yet further proved by two Things, *viz.* the Proceedings of the *African Fathers* in the caſe of *Zoſimus* about the *Nicene Canons* and the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Univerſæ*, both which yield an abundant Teſtimony to our Purpoſe. If ever there was a juſt Occaſion given for an early and exact Search into the Authentick *Canons* of the *Council* of *Nice*, it was certainly in that grand Debate between the *African Fathers* and the *Roman Biſhops* in the caſe of *Appeals*. For *Zoſimus* challenging not only a right of Appeals to himſelf, but a Power of diſpatching *Legates* unto the *African Churches* to hear Cauſes there, and all this by virtue of a *Canon* in the *Nicene Council*, and this being delivered to them in *Council* by *Fauſtinus*, *Philippus*, and *Aſellus*, whom *Zoſimus* ſent into *Africa*, to negotiate this Affair; no ſooner did they hear this, but they were ſtartled and amazed at it, that ſuch a Thing ſhould be challenged by virtue of a *Canon* in the *Council* of *Nice*, which they had never heard of before. Upon this they declare themſelves willing to yield to what ſhould appear to be determined by the *Nicene Canons*; thence they propound that a more exact Search might be made into the authentical *Copies* of them; for they profeſs no ſuch thing at all to appear, in all the *Greek Copies* which they had among them; although *Cæcilianus* the *Biſhop* of *Carthage* were preſent in the *Council* of *Nice*, and brought home thoſe Copies which were preſerved in the *Church* of *Africa*. For in all the *Subſcriptions* of the *Nicene Council*, whether *Arabick* or others, the Name of *Cæcilian* appears; now *Cæcilian* was immediate Predeceſſor in *Carthage* to *Aurelius*, who preſided in that *Council* wherein

Αὕτη ἡ συνελθοῦσα εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πολιτείας νόμους ἔγραψαν εἴκοσι. Theodoret. hiſt. Eccleſ l. 1. c. 7. ed. Sirmond. 1642.

Ἐξετέθησαν ἡ ἁγία ἐκκλησία εἰς κανόνας εἴκοσιν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Νικαίᾳ. Gelaſ. Acta. Concil. Nicen. lib. 2.

Τὸ τελευταῖον ἡ ἱερὰ ἐκτίθησιν εἴκοσιν εἰς κανόνας εἰωθὸς ὁμολογεῖν. Niceph. Eccleſiaſt. hiſt. l. 8. c. 19.

Quanquam Græci omnes aſſerant et tueantur, Nicæni Concilii Canones viginti tantum fuiſſe, &c Bin. not. in Concil. Nicæn. p. 366. To. 1. Ruffin. Eccleſiaſt. hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 5.

Viginti tantum capitula Nicænæ Synodi in Sanctâ Romanâ Eccleſiâ haberi. Gratian. diſtinct. 16. c. 20.

Deinde etiam 20. *capitulis Nicæni Concilii recitatis, communi decreto ſtatuerunt capitula* 37. *(ſive* 39.*) quæ ſubſequuntur* Vid. Juſtell. not. in Cod. Eccleſ. African. p. 14.

Quod non niſi viginti capitula quæ habemus in Nicæno Concilio fuerunt conſtituta. c. 21. apud Juſtell. ibid.

Codex. Can. Eccles. Afric. p. 58. wherein these Things were debated. And there it is expresly said, There were but twenty *Canons*. But in order to further Satisfaction, they decree that a Message should be sent on purpose to *Constantinople*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, to find out the Authentick Copies of the *Nicene Canons*, and after a most diligent Search no more *Canons* could be found than what the *African Fathers* had before. And thence in the Epistle of *Anticas* of *Constantinople*, written to the *Council* of *Carthage*, he acquaints them, that he, according to their desire, had sent them the true and compleat *Canons* (ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ) of the *Nicene Council*. And to the same purpose *Cyril* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, mentioning their Desires of having ἀληθέστατα ἴσα *the most true and authentick Copies* out of the *Archives* of that *Church*, so he tells them he had sent (τὰ πιστότατα ἴσα τὰ τῆς αὐθεντικῆς συνόδου τῆς ἐν τῇ Νικαίνῃ πόλει) *the most faithful Copies of the Authentick Synod of* Nice. Now if there had been any ground in the World for *Turrianus* his Conjecture, that the *Nicene Canons* were translated into *Arabick* by *Alexander*, who was present at the *Council*, for the Benefit of those in *Pentapolis*, or *Ægypt*, who only understood that Language (and that before the *Nicene Canons* were burnt, of which *Athanasius* complains); who was more likely to have found out these *Arabick Canons*, than *Cyril the Patriarch of* Alexandria, upon this occasion especially, when the full and authentick Copies were so extreamly desired? And since no such thing at all appeared then, upon the most diligent Inquiry, What can be more evident, than that these eighty *Arabick Canons* are the Imposture of some latter Age? Besides, if these *Canons* had been genuine and authentick, what imaginable Reason can be given why they were not inserted in the *Codex Canonum*, as the other twenty were? For, as *Jacobus Leschasserius* well observes, we are not to imagine that the *Ancient Church* was governed at *Randome* by loose and dispersed *Canons*, whereby it had been an easie Matter to have foisted in false and suppositious *Canons*; but that there was a certain Body and Collection of them digested into an exact Order; so that none could add to or take away any thing from it; and whatever *Canons* were not contained in this Body, had no Power or Force at all in the *Church*. And that there was such a *Codex Canonum*, that learned Person hath abundantly proved from the *Council of* Chalcedon, which hath many Passages referring to it; so that there is now no Question made, but that which *Justellus* published, is the true Collection of those *Canons* of the *Universal Church* which were inserted into the *Codex*; in which we find but only the twenty *Canons* of the *Nicene Council*; and that there could possibly be no more, appears by the Number of the *Canons*, as they are reckoned in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. From whence it follows, that only these twenty *Canons* were ever own'd by the *Universal Church*; for had the *Fathers* of the *Church* known of so many other *Canons* of the *Nicene Council*, (as surely at least the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria* could not be ignorant of them, if there had been any such) can we possibly think that those who had so great a *Veneration* for the *Nicene Council*, should have left the far greater part of the *Canons* of it, out of the *Code* of the *Churches Canons*? I am not ignorant of what is objected by *Binius*, *Bellarmine*, and others, to prove that there were more than twenty *Canons* of the Council of *Nice*; but those Proofs either depend upon Things as *supposititious* as the *Arabick Canons* themselves, such as the Epistles of *Julius* and *Athanasius ad Marcum*; or else they only prove, that several other Things were determined by the *Nicene Council*, as concerning the Celebration of *Easter*, *rebaptizing Hereticks*, and such like, which might be by the *Acts* of the

Codex Canon. p. 363.

Id. p. 360.

Turrian. præf. in Canon. Arab.

Consultatio de Controvers. inter Paul. 5. *& rempub. Venet. apud Goldast. Monarch. Rom.* 3. *p.* 444.

Council

Council without putting them into the *Canons*, as *Baronius* confeſſeth; but there cannot be any Evidence brought of any *Canon* which concerned the *Churches Polity* (for about that *Theodoret* and *Nicephorus* tell us the *Canons* were made) which was not among theſe twenty. So that it appears that theſe *Arabick Canons* are a meer Forgery of later Times, there being no Evidence at all that they were known to the *Church* in all the time of the four *General Councils*: and therefore *Baronius*, (notwithſtanding the Pretences of *Piſanus* and *Turrianus* from the *Alexandrian Copy*, and that out of *Marcellus* his *Library*, yet) ſince theſe *Canons* were unknown in the Controverſie of the *African Church* about the *Nicene Canons*, leaves the *Patronage* of them to ſuch as might be able to defend them. And *Spondanus* in his Contraction of him, (though in his Marginal Note he ſaith, *Baronius* was ſometimes more inclinable to the inlarged Number of the *Nicene Canons*) yet he relates it as his poſitive Opinion, that he rejected all but the twenty, whether *Arabick* or other, as ſpurious and ſuppoſititious. You ſee then what a fair Choice you have made of the third *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice* to prove the Superiority of the *Pope* over other *Patriarchs* by; when neither is it the third *Canon*, nor any *Canon* at all of the *Council of Nice*, but a ſpurious Figment, like thoſe of *Iſidore Mercator*, who thought all would paſs for gold which made for the Intereſt of the *Church* of *Rome*.

Quoniam hæc ignorâſſe majores viſi ſunt, quando oborta controverſia in Eccleſiâ Africanâ, de iis mentio neceſſaria incubuiſſet; hæc libentius aliis differenda relinquemus. Baron. ad An. 325. Parag. 108.

Quamobrem quod in Epiſtolâ quâdam Marci nomine 70. recenſcantur.— quodq; Turrianus profiteatur 80. inventos Arabicâ linguâ ſcriptos, Latinitate ſe donâſſe— quoniam hæc omnia ſcripta quibus ingens ille numerus Canonum ſtabilitur, prorſus incertæ vel potius nullius ſunt fidei; nec aliquis unquam probatus antiquitatis auctor amplius quam 20. Canones Nicenæ Synodi agnoviſſe reperiatur, cæteros ab aliis aſſertos libentius rejicimus. Spondan. Epitom. Baron. ad A. 325 n. 42.

But were there not ſuch a ſtrong and pregnant Evidence from Authority to make it appear that theſe *Canons* were *ſuppoſititious*, yet the Incongruity of them, with the ſtate of the *Church* at that time would abundantly manifeſt it, if we had time to compare many of thoſe *Canons* with it. But that which is moſt material to our Purpoſe, concerning *the Equality of the Patriarchs*, your following Words will put us upon a further Enquiry into. *This alſo*, ſay you (viz. *That the Pope was Head and Prince of all the Patriarchs*) *the practice of the Church ſhews, which is always the beſt Expoſitor and Aſſertor of the Canons. For not only the Pope's Confirmation was required to all new elected Patriarchs, but it belonged likewiſe to him to depoſe unworthy ones, and reſtore the unjuſtly depoſed by others. We read of no leſs than eight ſeveral Patriarchs of* Conſtantinople *depoſed by the Biſhop of* Rome. Sixtus *the third depoſed alſo* Polycronius *Biſhop of* Hieruſalem, *as his Acts ſet down in the firſt Tome of the Councils teſtifie. On the contrary*, Athanaſius *Patriarch of* Alexandria, *and* Paulus *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople, *were by* Julius *the firſt reſtored to their reſpective Sees, having been unjuſtly expelled by Hereticks. The ſame might be ſaid of divers others, over whom the Pope did exerciſe the like Authority; which he could never have done, upon any other ground, than that of Divine Right, and as being generally acknowledged St.* Peter's *Succeſſor in the Government of the whole Church.* Three Things I ſhall return you in Anſwer to this Diſcourſe. 1. *That the Practice of the Church doth not ſhew any ſuch Inequality as you contend for between the Pope and other Patriarchs.* 2. *That no ſuch Practice of the Church can be proved from the Inſtances by you brought*; And therefore, laſtly, *It by no means follows that the Pope exerciſed any ſuch Authority by Divine Right, or was acknowledged to be St.* Peter's *Succeſſor in the Government of the whole Church.* I begin with the Practice of the ancient *Church*, which is ſo far from being an Evidence of ſuch an Inequality of *Patriarchs* as that you contend for, that nothing doth more confirm that which his Lordſhip ſaith concerning the *Equality* of them than that doth. For which we appeal to

§. 5.

P. 184.

Nicol. Pap. ep. ad Michael. Imperat.

Sozom. l. 3. c. 7.

that famous Teſtimony to this Purpoſe in the ſixth *Canon* of the *Nicene Council. Let ancient Cuſtoms prevail; according to which, let the Biſhop of* Alexandria *have power over them who are in* Ægypt, Libya, *and* Pentapolis; *becauſe this was likewiſe the Cuſtom for the Biſhop of* Rome. *And accordingly in* Antioch *and other Provinces, let the Privileges be preſerved to the Churches.* Which *Canon* is the more remarkable, becauſe it is the *firſt* that ever was made by the *ancient Church* for regulating the *Rights* and *Privileges* of *Churches* over each other; which there was like to be now more conteſt about, not only by reaſon of the *Church's* Liberty under *Conſtantine*, but becauſe of the new *diſpoſition* of the *Empire* by him, which was made not long before the ſitting of the *Council* of *Nice*. But the particular Occaſion of this *Canon* is generally ſuppoſed to be this. *Meletius* an ambitious *Biſhop* in *Egypt*, much about the time that *Arrius* broached his Hereſie at *Alexandria*, takes upon him to ordain *Biſhops* and others in Egypt, without the Conſent of the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria*. This Caſe being brought before the *Nicene Fathers*, they pronounce theſe Ordinations *null*, depoſe *Meletius*, and, to prevent the like Practices for the future, do by this *Canon* confirm the ancient *Cuſtoms* of that Nature in the *Church*; ſo that the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* ſhould enjoy as full Right and Power over the Provinces of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*, as the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had over thoſe ſubject to him, as likewiſe *Antioch* and other *Churches* ſhould enjoy their former Privileges. Where we plainly ſee that the Ground of this Extent of Power is not attributed to any *Divine right* of *the Biſhop of Rome*, or any other *Metropolitan*, but to the *ancient Cuſtom of the Church*; whereby it had obtained that ſuch *Churches* that were deduced (as it were ſo many *Colonies*) from the *Mother-Church*, ſhould retain ſo much Reſpect to and Dependance upon her, as not to receive any *Biſhop* into them without the Conſent of that *Biſhop* who governed in the *Metropolis*. Which was the prime Reaſon of the Subordination of thoſe leſſer *Churches* to the *Metropolis*. And this Cuſtom being drawn down from the firſt plantation of *Churches*, and likewiſe much conducing to the preſerving of *Unity* in them, theſe *Nicene Fathers* ſaw *no Reaſon* to alter it, but *much* to confirm it. For otherwiſe, there might have been continual bandying and oppoſition of leſſer *Biſhops*, and *Churches* againſt the greater; and therefore the *Diſcipline* and *Unity* of the *Church* did call for this Subordination; which could not be better determined than by the ancient Cuſtom which had obtained in the ſeveral *Churches*. It being found moſt convenient that the *Churches* in their Subordination ſhould be moſt agreeable to the Civil *Diſpoſition* of the *Empire*. And therefore for our better underſtanding the Force and Effect of this *Nicene Canon*, we muſt caſt our Eye a little upon the *Civil Diſpoſition* of the *Roman Empire* by *Conſtantine*, then lately altered from the former Diſpoſition of it under *Auguſtus* and *Adrian*. He therefore diſtributed the Adminiſtration of the *Government* of the *Roman Empire* under four *Præfecti-Prætorio*; but for the more convenient Management of it, the whole Body of the *Empire* was caſt into ſeveral *Juriſdictions* containing many *Provinces* within them, which were in the Law call'd *Dioceſes*; over every one of which there was appointed a *Vicarius*, or Lieutenant, to one of the *Præfecti-Prætorio*, whoſe Reſidence was in the chief City of the *Dioceſe*, where the *Prætorium* was, and Juſtice was adminiſtred to all within that *Dioceſe*, and thither *Appeals* were made. Under theſe were thoſe *Proconſuls* or *Correctores* who ruled in the particular *Provinces*; and had their

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω· τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθες ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Concil. Nicen. Can. 6.

their Reſidence in the *Metropolis* of it, under whom were the particular *Magiſtrates* of every *City*; now according to this Diſpoſition of the *Empire*, the *Weſtern* part of it contained in it ſeven of theſe *Dioceſes*, as, under the *Præfectus-Prætorio Galliarum*, was the *Dioceſe* of *Gaul*, which contained ſeventeen Provinces; the Dioceſe of *Britain*, which contained five, (afterwards but three in *Conſtantine*'s time) the Dioceſe of *Spain*, ſeven. Under the *præfectus-Prætorio Italiæ*, was the *Dioceſe* of *Africa*, which had ſix Provinces, the *Dioceſe* of *Italy*, whoſe Seat was *Milan*, 7. the *Dioceſe* of *Rome*, 10. Under the *Præfectus-Prætorio Illyrici*, was the *Dioceſe* of *Illyricum*, in which were ſeventeen *Provinces*. In the *Eaſtern* Diviſion, were the *Dioceſe* of *Thrace*, which had ſix Provinces, the *Dioceſe* of *Pontus* 11. and ſo the *Dioceſe* of *Aſia*, the *Oriental* (properly ſo called) wherein *Antioch* was, 15. all which were under the *Præfectus-Prætorio Orientis*; the *Ægyptian Dioceſe*, which had ſix *Provinces*, was under the *Præfectus Auguſtalis*; in the time of *Theodoſius* the elder, *Illyricum* was divided into two *Dioceſes*, the *Eaſtern*, whoſe *Metropolis* was *Theſſalonica*, and had eleven *Provinces*, the *Weſtern*, whoſe Metropolis was *Syrmium*, and had ſix *Provinces*. According to this Diviſion of the *Empire*, we may better underſtand the Affairs and Government of the *Church*, which was model'd much after the ſame way; unleſs where *Ancient Cuſtom*, or the *Emperor's Edict*, did cauſe any Variation. For as the Cities had their *Biſhops*, ſo the *Provinces* had their *Arch-Biſhops*, and the *Dioceſes* their *Primates*, whoſe Juriſdiction extended as far as the *Dioceſe* did; and as the *Conventus Juridici* were kept in the chief City of the *Dioceſe* for Matters of *Civil Judicature*, ſo the chief *Eccleſiaſtical Councils* for the Affairs of the *Church*, were to be kept there too; for which there is an expreſs Paſſage in the *Codex* of *Theodoſius*, whereby care is taken, *That the ſame Courſe ſhould be uſed in Eccleſiaſtical, which was in civil Matters; ſo that ſuch Things which concerned them ſhould be heard in the Synods of the Dioceſe.* Where the Word *Dioceſe* is not uſed in the Sence the *African Fathers* uſed it in, for that which belonged to one *Biſhop* (as it is now uſed) but as it is generally uſed in the *Codex* of *Theodoſius* and *Juſtinian*, and the *Novels* and *Greek Canons*; for that which comprehends in it many *Provinces*, as a *Province* takes in ſeveral *Dioceſes* of particular *Biſhops*.

Codex Theodoſ. de Epiſcop. l. 23. *Qui mos eſt cauſarum civilium, iidem in negotiis Eccleſiaſticis obtinendi ſunt, ſi qua ſunt—ad religionis obſervantiam pertinentia, locis ſuis & à ſuæ diœceſeos Synodis audiantur.*

Theſe Things being premiſed, we may the better underſtand the Scope of the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*; in which three Things are to our purpoſe conſiderable; 1, That it ſuppoſeth particular Bounds and Limits ſet to the *Juriſdiction* of thoſe who are mentioned in it. 2. That what *Churches* did enjoy *Privileges* before this *Council*, had them confirmed by this *Canon*, as not to be altered. 3. That the *Churches* enjoying theſe *Privileges* were not ſubordinate to each other. §. 5.

1. That particular *Bounds* and *Limits* were ſuppoſed to the Power of thoſe *Churches* therein mentioned. For, although we grant that this *Canon* doth not fix or determine, What the Bounds were of the *Roman Biſhop*'s Power, yet that it doth ſuppoſe that it had its Bounds, is apparent from the Example being drawn from thence for the *Limits* of other *Churches*. For, What an unlikely thing is it, that the *Church* of *Rome* ſhould be made the Pattern for aſſigning the *Limits* of other *Metropolitan Churches*, if that had not its known *Limits* at that Time? And, Can any thing be more abſurd or unreaſonable, than the Anſwer which *Bellarmine* gives to this place, That the *Biſhop of* Alexandria *ought to govern thoſe Provinces, becauſe the* Roman *Biſhop hath ſo accuſtomed, i.e.* faith,

Quarta igitur & vera expoſitio eſt, Alexandrinum debere gubernare illas provincias,

quia Romanus Episcopus ita consuevit, id est, quia Romanus Episcopus ante omnem Conciliorum definitionem consuevit permittere Episcopo Alexandrino regimen Ægypti, Libyæ & Pentapolis. Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 13.

saith he, *To let the* Alexandrian *Bishop govern them.* Here is an *id est* with a Witness. What will not these Men break through, that can so confidently obtrude such monstrous Interpretations upon the credulous World! Is it possible to conceive when the *Canon* makes use of the Parallel of the *Roman Bishop*, and makes that the Ground *why the Bishop of* Alexandria *should enjoy full Power over those Provinces, because the Bishop of* Rome *did so*; that the meaning should be, *That he gave the Bishop of* Alexandria *Power to govern those Provinces?* They who can believe such Things, may easily find Arguments for the *Pope's unlimited Supremacy* every where. I make no Scruple to grant what *Bellarmine* contends for, from the Epistle of *Nicolaus* 1. That the *Council* did not herein assign *Limits* to the *Church* of *Rome*, but made that a Pattern whereby to order the *Government* of other *Churches*. And from thence it is sufficiently clear to any reasonable Man, that the *Limits* of her Government were, though not assigned, yet supposed by the *Council*. For otherwise, How absurd were it to say, *Let the Bishop of* Alexandria *govern* Ægypt, Libya, *and* Pentapolis, *because the Bishop of the Church of* Rome *hath no Limits at all, but governs the whole Church?* Doth not τὸ συνθὲς import some Parallel Custom in the *Church* of *Rome*, and name therefore what that is, supposing he hath no Limits set to his *Jurisdiction*? *Yes*, it may be you will reply, *He had Limits as a Metropolitan, but not as Head of the Church.* Grant me then, that he had Limits as *Metropolitan*, and then prove you, that ever he had any unlimited Power acknowledged as *Head of the Church*. Would they ever have made such an Instance in him, without any Discrimination of his *several Capacities*, if they had known any other *Power* that he had, but only as a *Metropolitan*? Nay, might not the *Bishops* of *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, be rather supposed to have the greater *Power*, because their *Provinces* were much larger here than his. And although *Bellarmine* useth that as his great Argument, Why *Ruffinus* his Exposition cannot hold, *Because the Bishop of* Rome *would have a lesser Diocese assigned him, than either the Bishops of* Antioch, *or* Alexandria; yet when we consider, What hath been said already of the Agreement of the *Civil and Ecclesiastical Government*, a sufficient Account may thence be given of it. For as the *Præfectus Augustalis* had all the Provinces of *Ægypt* for his *Diocese*, so had the *Bishop* of *Alexandria*; and, as the *Lieutenant* of *Antioch* had that which was properly called the *Orient*, containing fifteen *Provinces* under him, so had the *Bishop* of *Antioch*; and by the same Proportion, the *Power* of the *Bishop* of *Rome* did correspond to the *Diocese* of the *Roman Lieutenant*, which was over those Ten *Provinces*, which were subject to his *Jurisdiction*, as it was distinct from the *Diocese* of *Italy*, which was under that *Lieutenant*, whose Residence was at *Milan*. Here we see then a Parity of Reason in all of them; and therefore I cannot but think that the true Account of the *Suburbicary Churches* in *Ruffinus* his Exposition of this *Canon*, is, that which we have now set down, *viz.* those *Churches* which lay within the ten *Provinces* subject to the *Roman Lieutenant*. But of them more afterwards. That which I now insist on, is, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* had then a *limited Jurisdiction*, as other *Metropolitans* and *Primates* had. Nay, if we should grant that the *Title* produced by *Paschasinus* in the *Council* of *Chalcedon* to this *Canon*, were not such a *Forgery* as that of *Zosimus*, yet the most that could prove, was only this, That the *Roman Church* had always the *Primacy* within her *Diocese*, i. e. *all Metropolitical Power*; but not that it had an *unlimited Primacy* in the whole *Church*, which was a thing none of those *Fathers* who lived in the time

Time of the four *Councils*, did ever acknowledge; but always opposed any thing tending to it, as appears by those very Proceedings of *Paschasinus* at the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and by the *Canons* of that *Council*, and of the *Council* of *Constantinople*. And it is a rare Answer to say, *That those Canons are not allowed by the* Roman *Church*; for by that very Answer it appears, that they did oppose the *Pope's Supremacy*, or else doubtless they would have been allowed there. But that the *Pope's Metropolitical Power* was confined within the *Roman Diocese*, so as not to extend to the *Italick*, we have this pregnant Evidence, that it appears by the occasion of the *Nicene Canon*, that the main Power contested for, was that of *Ordination*; and it is evident by *Theodoret* and *Synesius* his Epistles, that the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* did retain it as his due by virtue of this *Canon*, to ordain the *Bishops* of *Pentapolis* as well as *Ægypt*. But now the *Bishop* of *Rome* did not ordain the *Bishop* of *Milan* who was in the *Italick Diocese*; for *S. Ambrose* was ordained *Bishop* by a *Synod* of *Italy*, at the Appointment of the Emperor *Valentinian*, and by an Epistle of *Pelagius*. 1. *A. D.* 555. it appears that the *Bishops* of *Aquileia* and *Milan*, were wont to ordain each other; which, though he would have believed, was only *to save Charges in going to* Rome; yet as that *learned* and ingenuous Person *Petrus de Marca* observes, *the true Reason of it, was, because* Milan *was the Head of the Italick Diocese, as appears by the Council of* Aquileia, *and therefore the Ordination of the Bishop of* Aquileia, *did of right belong to the Bishop of* Milan; *and the Ordination of the Bishop of* Milan *did belong to him of* Aquileia, *as the chief Metropolitan of the general Synod of the Italick Diocese.* Although afterwards the *Bishops* of *Rome* got it so far into their Hands, that their Consent was necessary for such an Ordination, yet that was only when they began more openly to encroach upon the Liberties of other *Churches*. But, as the same learned Author goes on, those *Provinces* which lay out of *Italy*, did undoubtedly ordain their own *Metropolitans*, without the Authority or Consent of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, which he there largely proves of the *African*, *Spanish*, and *French Churches*. It follows then from the Scope of the *Nicene Canon*, and the Practice of the *Church*, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* had a limited Jurisdiction, as the *Bishops* of *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, and other *Primates* had.

Theodoret. l. 1. c. 9. Synes. ep. ad Theophil. Alexand.

Cum vera hujus instituti ratio in eo consistat quod cum Mediolanum esset caput Diœceseos Italicæ, ut constat ex Concilio Aquileiensi, ordinatio Metropolitæ Aquileiensis ad Episcopum Mediolanensem optimo jure pertinebat; Primatis verò Mediolanensis ordinatio ad Aquileiensem Episcopum, quod primus esset inter Metropolitanos Synodi Generalis Diœceseos Italicæ. Petrus de Marcâ de Concord. Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 6. c. 4. sect. 7.

Ibid. sect. 8.

2. *That what Churches did enjoy Privileges before, had them confirmed by this Canon, as not to be altered.* For it makes Provision against any such Alteration, by ordaining that the ancient Customs should be in force still. And accordingly we find it decreed in the *second Canon* of the *Constantinopolitan Council*, *That the same Limits of Dioceses should be observed, which were decreed in the Council of* Nice; *and that none should intrude to do any thing in the Dioceses of others.* And by the earnest and vehement Epistles of *Pope Leo* to *Anatolius*, we see the main thing he had to plead against the Advancement of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* was, that by this means the *most sacred Decrees of the Council of* Nice *would be violated.* We see then, that those Privileges which belonged to *Churches* then, ought still to be inviolably observed; so that those *Churches* which then had *Primates* and *Metropolitans* of their own, might plead their own right by Virtue of the *Nicene Canon*. So we find it decreed in that *Council of* Ephesus in the famous case of the *Cyprian Bishops*; for their *Metropolitan* being dead (*Troilus* the *Bishop* of *Constance*) the *Bishop* of *Antioch* pretended that it

§. 6.

it belonged to him to ordain their *Metropolitan*, becauſe *Cyprus* was within the civil Juriſdiction of the *Dioceſe* of *Antioch*; upon this the *Cyprian Bishops* make their Complaint to the *General Council* at *Epheſus*, and ground it upon that ancient Cuſtom which the *Nicene Canon* inſiſts on, *viz.* that their *Metropolitan* had been exempt from the *Juriſdiction* of the *Bishop* of *Antioch*, and was ordained by a *Synod* of *Cyprian Bishops*, which Privilege was not only confirmed to them by the *Epheſine Council*, but a general Decree paſſed, *That the Rights of every Province should be preſerved whole and inviolate, which it had of old according to ancient Cuſtom.* Which was not a Decree made meerly in Favour of the *Cyprian Bishops*, but a common aſſerting the *Rights* of *Metropolitans*, that they ſhould be held inviolate. Now therefore it appears, that all the *Churches* then were far from being under one of the *three Patriarchs* of *Rome*, *Antioch*, or *Alexandria*; for, not only the three *Dioceſes* of *Pontus*, *Aſia*, and *Thracia*, were exempt (although afterwards they voluntarily ſubmitted to the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*) but likewiſe all thoſe *Churches* which were in diſtinct *Dioceſes* from theſe, had *Primates* of their own, who were independent upon any other. Upon which account it hath not only been juſtly pleaded in behalf of the *Britannick Churches*, that they are exempt from the Juriſdiction of the *Roman Bishop*; but it is ingenuouſly confeſſed by *Father* Barns, *That the Britannick Church might plead the* Cyprian *Privilege, that it was ſubject to no Patriarch. And, although this Privilege was taken away by Force and Tumult, yet being reſtored by the conſent of the Kingdom, in* Henry 8. *time, and quietly enjoyed ſince, it ought to be retained for Peace ſake, without prejudice of Catholiciſm, and the Brand of Schiſm.* If ſo, certainly it can be no *Schiſm*, to withdraw from the uſurped Authority of the *Roman Church*. But theſe Things have been more largely inſiſted on by others, and therefore I paſs them over.

Concil. Epheſ. act. 7. part 2. p. 424.

Ἔδοξε τοίνυν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ σώζεσθαι ἑκάστου ἐπαρχίᾳ, καθαρὰ δὲ ἄβατα τὰ αὐτῇ προσόντα δίκαια ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄνωθεν κατὰ τὸ πάλαι κρατῆσαν ἔθος. Concil. Epheſ. Can. 8. in edit. vero Binii ante Canones habetur. Tom. 2. Concil. Part. 2. Act. 7. p. 426.

Inſula autem Britanniæ gaviſa eſt olim privilegio Cyprio ut nullius Patriarchæ legibus ſubderetur. Hoc autem Privilegium etſi abolitum olim fuit bellorum tumultibus & vi, tamen cum tempore Henrici 8. totius regni conſenſu fuerit repetitum, & ab eo tempore pacificè præſcriptum: videtur pacis ergô retineri debere, ſine diſpendio Catholiciſmi, & abſq; Schiſmatis ullius notâ. Barns Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, MS. ſect. 3.

3. From thence it follows, that there was then an *Equality*, not only among the *Patriarchs* (whoſe Name came not up till ſome time after the *Council* of *Nice*) but among the ſeveral *Primates* of *Dioceſes*, all enjoying equal Power and Authority over their reſpective *Dioceſes*, without Subordination to each other. But here it is vehemently pleaded by ſome, who yet are no *Friends* to the unlimited Power of the *Roman Bishop*, *That it is hardly conceivable, that he should have no other Power in the Church, but meerly as Head of the* Roman *Dioceſe, and that it appears by the Acts of the Church he had a regular Preheminence above others in ordering the Affairs of the Church.* To which I anſwer, 1. If this be granted, it is nothing at all to that *Univerſal Paſtorship* over the *Church*, which our *Adverſaries* contend for, *as due by Divine Right, and acknowledged to be ſo by conſent of the Church* Let the *Bishop* of *Rome* then quit his former Plea, and inſiſt only on this, and we ſhall ſpeedily return an Anſwer, and ſhew, How far this *Canonical Primacy* did extend. But, as long as he challengeth a *Supremacy* upon other Grounds, he forfeits this *Right*, whatever it is, which comes by the *Canons* of the *Church*. 2. What meerly comes by the *Canons* of the *Church*, cannot bind the *Church* to an abſolute Submiſſion, in caſe that Authority be abuſed to the *Churches* apparent Prejudice. For the *Church* can never give away her *Power* to ſecure her ſelf againſt whatever Incroachments tend to the *Injury* of it. This Power then may be reſcinded by the Parts of the *Church*, when

when it tends to the Miſchief of it. 3. This *Canonical Preheminence* is not the main thing we diſpute with the *Church* of *Rome*; let her reform her ſelf from all thoſe Errors and Corruptions which are in her Communion, and reduce the *Church* to the Primitive Purity and Simplicity of Faith and Worſhip, and then ſee if we will quarrel with the *Primacy* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, according to the *Canons*, or any regular Preheminence in him meerly in order to the *Churches* Peace and Unity. But this is not the Caſe between us and them, they challenge an *unlimited Power*, and that by *Divine Right*, and nothing elſe will ſatisfie them but this, although there be neither any ground in *Scripture* for it, nor any Evidence of it in the *Practice* of the *Ancient Church.*

But however, we muſt ſee, what you produce for it: Firſt, you ſay, *The Pope's Confirmation was required to all new elected Patriarchs.* To that I ſhall return the full and ſatisfactory Anſwer of the late renowned *Archbishop* of *Paris*, *Petrus de Marcâ*, where he propounds this as an Objection out of *Baronius*, and thus ſolves it; *That the Confirmation of Patriarchs by the Bishop of* Rome, *was no token of Juriſdiction, but only of receiving into Communion, and a Teſtimony of his Conſent to the Conſecration already performed.* And this was no more than was done by other *Bishops* in reference to the *Bishop* of *Rome* himſelf; for *S. Cyprian* writing to *Antonianus* about the Election of *Cornelius* ſaith, *That he was not only choſen by the Suffrage of the People, and Teſtimony of the Clergy; but that his Election was confirmed by all their Conſent.* May not you then as well ſay, That the *Bishop* of *Carthage* had Power over the *Bishop* of *Rome*, becauſe his Ordination was confirmed by him, and other *African Bishops.* But any one who had underſtood better than you ſeem to do, the Proceedings of the *Church* in thoſe Ages, would never have made this an Argument of the *Pope's* Authority over other *Patriarchs*, ſince, as the ſame *Petrus de Marcâ* obſerves, *It was the Cuſtom in thoſe Times, that not only the Patriarhs but the* Roman *Bishop himſelf upon their Election, were wont to ſend abroad Letters teſtifying their Ordination, to which was added a Profeſſion of Faith contained in their Synodical Epiſtles.* Upon the receipt of which, *Communicatory Letters* were ſent to the Perſon newly ordained, to teſtifie their *Communion* with him, in caſe there were no juſt Impediment produced. So that this was only a matter of *Fraternal Communion*, and importing nothing at all of *Juriſdiction*; but the *Bishops* of *Rome*, who were ready to make uſe of all Occaſions to advance their own *Grandeur*, did in time make uſe of this for quite other Ends, than it was primarily intended; for, in caſe of any Suſpicions and Jealouſies of any thing that might tend to the diſ-ſervice of their *See*, they would then deny their *Communicatory Letters*, as *Simplicius* did in the caſe of the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria.* And in that Confirmation of *Anatolius* by *Leo* 1. which *Baronius* ſo much inſiſts on, *Leo* himſelf gives a ſufficient account of it, *viz. to manifeſt that there was but one entire Communion among them throughout the World.* So that if the *Pope*'s own Judgment may be taken, this Confirmation of new elected *Patriarchs* imported nothing of *Juriſdiction* But, in caſe the *Popes* did deny their *Communicatory Letters*, that did not preſently hinder them from the

Quod ad Patriarchas attinet, reſponderi poteſt, Confirmationem illam non eſſe ſignum juriſdictionis, ſed tantum ſuſceptionis in communionem, & teſtimonium quo conſtabat, ſummum Pontificem conſentire conſecrationi jam peractæ. Petrus de Marca de Concord. c. Sacerdot. & Imper. l. 6. c. 5. ſect. 2.

Factus eſt autem Cornelius Epiſcopus de Dei & Chriſti ejus judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium teſtimonio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit ſuffragio, & de Sacerdotum antiquorum & bonorum virorum Collegio ----Cum Fabiani locus vacaret, quo occupato de Dei voluntate & omnium noſtrum conſentione Firmato. Cyprian. ep. 52. p. 75. ed. Rigalt.

Quippe uſu receptum erat per illas tempeſtates, ut Patriarchæ, & ipſe etiam Romanus Pontifex recens electus, literas de ſuâ ordinatione mitterent; quibus addebatur profeſſio fidei in Synodicis eorum Epiſtolis conſcripta. Petrus de Marca ib

Ut per totum mundum una nobis ſit unius Communionis integritas, in qua ſocietatem tuæ dilectionis amplectimur, & geſtorum quæ ſumpſimus ſeriem, neceſſariis munitam ſubſcriptionibus approbamus. Leo 1. ep. 38.

the Execution of their Office; as appears by the Inſtance of *Flavianus*, the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*: for although three *Roman Biſhops* ſucceſſively oppoſed him, *Damaſus*, *Syricius*, and *Anaſtaſius*, and uſed great Importunity with the *Emperor*, that he might not continue in his Place, yet becauſe the *Churches* of the *Orient*, *Aſia*, *Pontus*, and *Thracia*, did approve of him, and communicate with him, he oppoſed their conſent againſt the *Biſhops* of *Rome*. Upon which, and the *Emperor's* ſevere checking them for their Pride and Contention, they at laſt promiſed the *Emperor*, that they would lay aſide their Enmity, and acknowledge him. So that, notwithſtanding whatever the *Roman Biſhops* could do againſt him, he was acknowledged for a *true Patriarch*, and at laſt their Conſent was given only by renewing *Communion* with him; which certainly is far from being an Inſtance of the *Pope's Power* over the other *Patriarchs*.

Theodoret. l. 5. c. 23.

§. 8. P. 184. Whereby we alſo ſee, What little Power he had in depoſing them; although you tell us, *That it belonged likewiſe to him to depoſe unworthy ones, and reſtore the unjuſtly depoſed by others.* But, that the Power of depoſing *Biſhops* was anciently in *Provincial Councils*, appears ſufficiently by the *fifth Canon* of the *Nicene Council*, and by the Practice of the *Church*, both before and after it; and it is acknowledged by *Petrus de Marcâ*, that the *ſole Power* of depoſing *Biſhops*, was not in the Hands of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, till about eight hundred Years ſince; and refutes the *Cardinal Perron* for ſaying otherwiſe; and afterwards largely proves, that the *Supreme Authority* of *depoſing Biſhops*, was ſtill in *Provincial Council*, and that the *Pope* had nothing to do in it, till the Decree of the *Sardican Synod*, in the caſe of *Athanaſius*; which yet, he ſaith, did not (as is commonly ſaid) decree *Appeals* to be made to *Rome*, but only gave the *Biſhop* of *Rome* Power to *Review* their Actions, but ſtill reſerving to *Provincial Councils* that *Authority* which the *Nicene Council* had eſtabliſhed them in. All the Power which he then had, was only this, that he might decree that the Matters might be handled over again, but not that he had the Power himſelf of depoſing or reſtoring *Biſhops*: Which is proved with that Clearneſs and Evidence by that excellent Author, that I ſhall refer you to him for it; and conſider the Inſtances produced by you to the contrary. *We read* (ſay you) *of no leſs than eight ſeveral Patriarchs of* Conſtantinople *depoſed by the Biſhop of* Rome. Surely, if you had read this your ſelf, you would have quoted the place, with more Care and Accuracy than you do; for you give us only a blind Citation of an Epiſtle of *Pope Nicolaus*, to the *Emperor Michael*, neither citing the Words, nor telling us which it is, when there are ſeveral, and thoſe no very ſhort ones neither. But however, it is well choſen, to have a *Pope's* Teſtimony in his own Cauſe, and that ſuch a *Pope* who was then in Conteſt with the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, and that too ſo long after the Encroachments of the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, it being in the *ninth Century*; and yet for all this, this *Pope* doth not ſay thoſe Words which you would faſten upon him; that which he ſaith, is, *That none of the Biſhops of* Conſtantinople, *or ſcarce any of them, were ejected without the conſent of the Biſhop of* Rome. And then inſtanceth in *Maximus*, *Neſtorius*, *Acacius*, *Anthimus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paulus*, *Petrus*; but his deſign in this, is only to ſhew that *Ignatius* the Patriarch ought not to have been depoſed without his Conſent. But what is all this to the *Pope's ſole Power of depoſing?* When even at that time the *Pope* did not challenge it: But, ſuppoſing the *Popes* had done it before, it doth not follow that it was in their *Power* to do it, and that the *Canons* had given them right to do it, but leaſt of all certainly, that they had a *Divine Right* for it, which never was in the

De Concord. l. 7. c. 1. ſect. 6.

Aut nunquam omnino, aut certè vix, horum aliquis ſine conſenſu Romani Pontificis reperitur ejectus. Nicol. 1. epiſt. 8. Michael. Imp. Tom. 6. Concil. p. 506.

the leaſt acknowledged by the *Church* as to a Depoſition of *Patriarchs*, which you contend for. But beſides this, you ſay, Sixtus *the third depoſed* Polychronius Biſhop of *Hieruſalem*. Whereas *Sixtus* only ſent eight Perſons from a *Synod* at *Rome* to *Hieruſalem*, who when they came there, did not offer to depoſe *Polychronius* by virtue of the *Pope's Power*; but a *Synod* of ſeventy or more neighbour Biſhops were call'd, by whom he was depoſed; and yet after all this, *Binius* himſelf condemns thoſe *Acts* which report this Story, for ſpurious; there being a manifeſt Repugnancy in the Time of them, and no ſuch Perſon as *Polychronius* ever mentioned by the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians* of that Time, and other fabulous Narrations inſerted in them. Yet theſe are your goodly Proofs of the Pope's Power to depoſe *Patriarchs*. *Tom. 2. Concil. P. 685.*

But we muſt ſee whether you have any better Succeſs in proving his Power to reſtore ſuch as were depoſed; for which you only inſtance in *Athanaſius* and *Paulus* reſtored by *Julius*; whoſe Caſe muſt be further examined, which, in ſhort, is this: *Athanaſius* being condemned by the *Synods* of *Tyre* and *Antioch*, goes to *Rome*, where he and *Paulus* are received into Communion by *Julius*, who would not accept of the Decree of the *Eaſtern Biſhops* which was ſent after him to *Rome*. For Pope *Julius* did not formally offer to reſtore *Athanaſius* to his *Church*, but only owned and received him into *Communion* as Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and that becauſe he looked on the Proceedings as unjuſt in his Condemnation. And all that *Julius* himſelf pleads for, is, not a Power to depoſe or reſtore Patriarchs himſelf, but only that ſuch Things ought not to have been done without communicating thoſe Proceedings to him, which the *Unity* of the *Church* might require. And therefore *Petrus de Marca* ſaith, that *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and *Perron* are all ſtrangely out in this Story, when they would infer, That the Cauſes of the *Eaſtern* Biſhops upon Appeal were to be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*: whereas all that *Julius* pleads for, is, that ſuch Things ſhould not be done by the *Eaſtern* Biſhops alone, which concerned the Depoſition of ſo great a Perſon in the *Church* as the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, but that there ought to be a *Council* both of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Biſhops; on which Account afterwards the *Sardican Synod* was called. But when we conſider with what Heat and Stomach this was received by the *Eaſtern* Biſhops, how they abſolutely deny that the *Weſtern* Biſhops had any more to do with their Proceedings, than they had with theirs; when they ſay, that the Pope by this Uſurpation, was the Cauſe of all the Miſchief that followed, we ſee what an excellent Inſtance you have made choice of, to prove the Pope's Power of reſtoring *Biſhops by Divine Right, and that this was acknowledged by the whole Church.* *L. 7. c. 4. ſect. 6.*

The next Thing to be conſidered, is that Speech of St. *Auguſtine*, *That in the Church of* Rome *there did always flouriſh the Principality of an Apoſtolick Chair.* As to which his Lordſhip ſaith, *That neither was the word* Principatus *ſo great, nor the Biſhops of thoſe times ſo little, as that* Principes *and* Principatus *are not commonly given them both by the Greek and Latin Fathers of this great and learneſt Age of the Church, made up of the fourth and fifth hundred years, always underſtanding* Principatus *of their ſpiritual Power, and within the Limits of their ſeveral Juriſdictions, which perhaps now and then they did occaſionally exceed. And there is not one Word in St.* Auguſtine, *that this Principality of the Apoſtolick Chair in the Church of* Rome *was then, or ought to be now exerciſed over the whole Church of Chriſt, as* Bellarmine *inſinuates there, and as* A. C. *would have it here.* To all this you ſay nothing to Purpoſe; but only tell us, *That the Biſhop by this makes way to ſome other pretty* ¶. 9. *In Romana Eccleſiâ ſemper Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ viguit Principatus.* S. Aug. Epiſt. 162. P. 168. P. 184.

Perverſions (as you call them) *of the ſame Father. For we muſt know,* ſay you, *that he is entering upon that main Queſtion concerning the* Donatiſts *of* Africk; and he is ſo indeed, and that not only for clearing the meaning of St. *Auguſtine* in the preſent Epiſtle, but of the whole Controverſie, to which a great Light will be given by a true account of thoſe Proceedings. Thus then his Lordſhip goes on. *And to prove that St.* Auguſtine *did not intend* P. 169. *by* Principatus *here to give the* Roman *Biſhop any Power out of his own Limits (which God knows were far ſhort of the whole Church) I ſhall make it moſt manifeſt out of the ſame Epiſtle. For afterwards (ſaith St.* Auguſtine*) when the Pertinacy of the* Donatiſts *could not be reſtrained by the* African *Biſhops, only they gave them leave to be heard by foreign Biſhops. And after that he hath theſe Words: And yet peradventur* Melchiades *the Biſhop of the* Roman *Church, with his Colleagues the tranſmarine Biſhops,* non debuit, *ought not to uſurp to himſelf this Judgment which was determined by Seventy* African *Biſhops;* Tigiſitanus, *ſitting Primate. And what will you ſay if he did not uſurp this Power? For the Emperor being deſired ſent Biſhops Judges, which ſhould ſit with him, and determine what was juſt upon the whole Cauſe. In which Paſſage,* ſaith his Lordſhip, *there are very many things obſervable. As firſt, That the* Roman *Prelate came not in till there was leave for them to go to Tranſmarine Biſhops. Secondly, That if the Pope had come in without this Leave, it had been an Uſurpation Thirdly, That when he did thus come in, not by his own Authority, but by Leave, there were other Biſhops made Judges with him. Fourthly, That theſe other Biſhops were appointed and ſent by the Emperor and his Power; that which the Pope leaſt of all will endure. Laſtly, Leſt the Pope and his Adherents ſhould ſay, this was an Uſurpation in the Emperor, St.* Auſtin *tells us a little before in the ſame Epiſtle ſtill, that this doth chiefly belong* ad curam ejus, *to the Emperor's Care and Charge, and that he is to give an account to God for it. And* Melchiades *did ſit and judge the Buſineſs with all Chriſtian Prudence and Moderation. So at this Time the Roman Prelate was not received as Paſtor of the whole Church,* ſay A. C. *what he pleaſe; nor had he Supremacy over the other Patriarchs.* In order to the better ſhaping your Anſwer to this Diſcourſe, you pretend to give us a *true Narrative* of the *Donatiſts* Proceedings, by the ſame Figure that *Lucian*'s Book is inſcribed *De vera hiſtoria.* There are ſeveral Things therefore to be taken notice of in your Narrative, before we come to your particular Anſwers, whoſe ſtrength depends upon the Matters of *Fact.*

Pergant ad Fratres & Collegas noſtros tranſmarinarum Eccleſiarum Epiſcopos. S. Aug. Ep. 162.

An forte non debuit Romanæ Eccleſiæ Miltiades Epiſcopus cum Collegis tranſmarinis Epiſcopis illud ſibi uſurpare judicium quod ab Afris Septuaginta, ubi Primas Tigiſitanus præſedit, fuerit terminatum. Quid quod nec ipſe uſurpaverit? Rogatus quippe Imperator, Judices miſit Epiſcopos, qui cum eo ſederent, & de totâ illâ cauſâ, quod juſtum videretur, ſtatuerent. S. Aug. ib.

Ad cujus curam, de quâ rationem Deo redditurus eſt, res illa maximè pertinebat. Id. ib.

Firſt, You give no ſatisfactory Account at all, Why, if the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtorſhip* had been then owned, the firſt *Appeal* on both Sides was not made to the Biſhop of *Rome*, for in ſo great a *Schiſm* as that was between the different Parties of *Cæcilian* and *Majorinus*, To whom ſhould they have directly gone but to *Melchiades* then Biſhop of *Rome?* How comes it to paſs that there is no mention at all of his *Judgment* by either Party, till *Conſtantine* had appointed him to be one of the *Judges?* St. *Auſtin* indeed pleads in behalf of *Cæcilian*, why he would not be judged by the *African Synod of LXX. Biſhops, that there were thouſands of his Colleagues on the other ſide the Sea, whom he might be tryed by.* But why not by the *Biſhop of* Rome *alone*, if the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* did belong to him? *Aug. ep 162.* But your Narrative gives us a rare Account, why the *Donatiſts* did not go to the Pope before they went to the Emperor, *viz. That they durſt not appear there,*

there, or elſe knew it would be to little purpoſe. But by what Arguments do you prove *they durſt not appear there before*, when we ſee they went readily thither *after* the *Emperor* had appointed *Rome* for the Place, where their Cauſe was to be heard; if they thought it were to ſo little purpoſe? For we ſee the *Donatiſts* never except againſt the *Place* at all, or the *Perſon* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; but upon the Command of *Conſtantine* made known to them by *Anulinus* the *Proconſul* of *Africa*, ten of their Party go to *Rome* to negotiate their Affairs before the *Delegates*. This is but therefore a very lame Account, why the *firſt Appeal* ſhould be to the *Emperor* and not to the *Pope*, if he had been then known to be the *Univerſal Paſtor* of the *Church*. But ſay you further, *The Emperor diſliked their Proceedings, and told them expreſly, That it belonged not to him, neither durſt he act the part of a Judge in a cauſe of Biſhops.* But on what grounds *he durſt not do it*, we may eaſily judge by his undertaking it at laſt, and paſſing a final Judgment in this *Cauſe* himſelf after the *Councils at* Rome, *at* Arles, could not put an end to it. If *Conſtantine* had judged it *unlawful*, could their Importunity have excuſed it? and could it be any other than *unlawful* if the *Pope* were the *Univerſal Paſtor* of the *Church*? Do you think it would be accounted a ſufficient Plea among you now, for any *Prince* to aſſume to himſelf the Judgment of any Cauſe already determined by the *Pope*, becauſe of the *Importunity* of the Perſons concerned in it? Indeed *Conſtantine* did at firſt prudently wave the Buſineſs himſelf, and that I ſuppoſe the rather, becauſe the *Donatiſts* in their Petition had intreated, that ſome of the *Biſhops* of *Gaul* might umpire the Buſineſs; either becauſe that was then the Place of the *Emperor*'s Reſidence, or elſe that *Gaul* under *Conſtantius* had eſcaped the late Perſecution, and therefore were not liable to the Suſpicion of thoſe Crimes whereof *Cæcilian* and *Felix* of *Aptung* were accuſed. But however, though *Conſtantine* did not ſit as *Judge* himſelf, he appointed *Marinus*, *Rheticius*, and *Maternus*, to join with *Melchiades* the *Biſhop* of *Rome* in the determining this Caſe. *But this he did*, you ſay, *to comply with the Donatiſts.* What, to join other *Biſhops* with the *Head* of the *Church* in equal Power for deciding Controverſies? and all this meerly to comply with the *Schiſmatical Donatiſts*? Was this, think you, becoming one who believed the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip by Divine Right*? Well fare then the Anſwer of others who love to ſpeak plain Truths, and impute all theſe Proceedings to *Conſtantine*'s Ignorance of his Duty, being yet but a *Catechumen* in *Chriſtian Religion*, and therefore did, he knew not what: But methinks the *Univerſal Paſtor*, or ſome of thoſe nineteen *Biſhops* who ſat at *Rome* in this Buſineſs, or of thoſe two hundred who you ſay met afterwards at *Arles* about it, ſhould have a little better inſtructed him in his Duty; and not let him go ſo far on in it, as from delegating *Judges* to hear it, and among them the *Head* of the *Church*, to reſume it afterwards himſelf both to hear and determine it. *If the Emperor had* (as you ſay) *proteſted againſt this as in it ſelf unlawful*, would none of the *Biſhops* hinder him from doing it? But where doth *Conſtantine* profeſs againſt it *as in it ſelf unlawful*? if ſo, no Circumſtances, no Importunities could ever make it lawful: Unleſs you think the *Importunity* of *Joſeph*'s *Miſtreſs* would have made *Adultery* no *Sin* in him. If *Conſtantine ſaid he would ask the Biſhop's Pardon in it*, that might be, as looking on them as the more competent *Judges*, but not thinking it *unlawful in it ſelf* for him to do, as you ſay. P. 180.

Well, but you tell us, *It was rather the Juſtice and Moderation of the Roman Prelate, that he came not in before it was due Time, and the matter orderly brought before him.* I am very much of your mind in this, and if all *Popes* §. 10.

ſince *Melchiades* had uſed *the ſame Juſtice and Moderation*, to have ſtaid till Things had been orderly brought to them, and not uſurped upon the Privileges of other *Churches*, Things had been in a far better Condition in the Chriſtian World than they are. Had there been none but ſuch as *Melchiades*, who ſhewed ſo much Chriſtian Prudence and Moderation in the Management of this Buſineſs, that great *Schiſm*, which your *Church* hath cauſed by her arrogant Pretences, might have been prevented. But how come you to know, *that this Caſe did properly belong to the Pope's Cognizance*? Who told you this? to be ſure not the Emperor *Conſtantine*, who in his Epiſtle to *Miltiades*, extant in *Euſebius*, intimates no ſuch thing; but only writes to him as one *delegated* to hear that Cauſe with the other *Biſhops*, and gives him *Inſtructions* in order to it. Do the *Donatiſts* or their *Adverſaries* mention any ſuch thing? Doth the *Pope* himſelf ever expreſs or intimate it? It ſeems, he wanted your *Information* much at that time. Or it may be, like the late Pope *Innocent* in the caſe of the five *Propoſitions*, he might ſay, *he was bred no Divine*, and therefore might the leſs underſtand his Duty. But can it poſſibly enter into your Head, *That this Caſe came to the Pope at laſt by way of regular Appeal*, as you ſeem to aſſert afterwards? Is this the way of *Appeals* to go to the *Emperor* and Petition him to appoint *Judges* to hear the Caſe? If the caſe of *Appeals* muſt be determined from theſe *Proceedings*, to be ſure, the *laſt Reſort* will be to the *Emperor* himſelf, as well as the *firſt Appeal.*

Euſeb. l. 10. *c.* 5.

Whether *the* African *Biſhops gave leave to the Donatiſts to be heard by foreign Biſhops, or they took it themſelves*, is not much material, becauſe the *Schiſm* was ſo great at Home, that there was no likelihood of any ending the Controverſie by ſtanding to a fair *Arbitration* among themſelves. And therefore there ſeemed a Neceſſity on both Sides of referring the Buſineſs to ſome unconcerned Perſons, who might hear the *Allegations*, and judge indifferently between them. And no other way did the nineteen *Biſhops* at *Rome* proceed with them, but as indifferent Arbitrators; and therefore the Witneſſes and Allegations on both Sides were brought before them; but we read of no *Power* at all challenged abſolutely to bind the Perſons to the Judgment of the *Church* of *Rome*, as the final Judgment in the caſe. The Queſtion, *Whether the Pope had uſurped this Power or no*, depends not upon the *Donatiſts Queſtion, Whether* Melchiades *ought to have undertaken the Judgment of that Cauſe which had been already determined by a Synod of LXX. Biſhops in* Africk? But upon St. *Auguſtin*'s Anſwer, who juſtifies the lawfulneſs of his doing it, becauſe he was thereto appointed by the *Emperor*. But when you ſay, *St.* Auſtin *gives this Anſwer only* per ὑπέκκαυσιν *by way of Condeſcenſion to his Adverſaries way of ſpeaking*: you would do well to prove elſewhere from St. *Auſtin*, that when he lays aſide his *Rhetorick*, he ever ſpeaks otherwiſe, but that it would have been an *Uſurpation* in the *Pope* to challenge to himſelf the hearing of thoſe *Cauſes* which had been determined by *African Biſhops*. But what St. *Auguſtine*'s Judgment, as well as the other *African Fathers* was in this Point, abundantly appears from the Controverſies between them and the *Biſhop* of *Rome* in the caſe of *Appeals*. It ſufficiently appears already, *That neither our Saviour, nor the Canons of the Univerſal Church, gave the Pope leave to hear and judge the Cauſes of St.* Athanaſius *and other Patriarchs and Biſhops of the Church*; and therefore you were put to your Shifts when you run thither for Security. But that which follows is notoriouſly falſe, *That when he did ſo interpoſe, no Man (no not the Perſons themſelves who were intereſted and ſuffered by his Judgment) complained or accuſed him of Uſurpation*; when in the caſe of *Athanaſius* it is ſo vehemently

P 187.

pleaded

pleaded by the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, that the *Pope* had nothing at all to do in it; but they might as well call in Queſtion what was done at *Rome*, as he what was done at *Antioch*. Nay, name us any one Cauſe in that Age of the *Church*, where the *Pope* did offer to meddle in Matters determined by other *Biſhops*, which he was not oppoſed in, and the Perſons concern'd did not complain and accuſe him of meddling with what he had no Right to, which are but other Words for *Uſurpation*.

You ſay, *The Biſhops whom the Emperor ſent as Judges with the Pope, were an inconſiderable Number to ſway the Sentence.* It ſeems *three to one* are with you an inconſiderable Number. But ſay you, *The Pope to ſhew his Authority added fifteen other Biſhops of* Italy *to be his Colleagues and Aſſiſtants in the Buſineſs.* Either theſe fifteen *Biſhops* were properly *Judges* in the Cauſe, or only *Aſſiſtants* for better Management and ſpeedier Diſpatch; if they were *Judges*, how prove you that *Conſtantine* did not appoint them? if they were only *Aſſiſtants* and *Suffragans* to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as is moſt probable (except *Merocles* Biſhop of *Milan*) what *Authority* did the Pope ſhew in calling his *Suffragans* to his *Aſſiſtance* in a matter of that Nature, which required ſo much Examination of *Witneſſes*? But the Pope had more effectually ſhewn his Authority, if he had refuſed the Biſhops whom *Conſtantine* ſent; and told him he meddled with that which did not concern him, to appoint any *Judges* at all in a matter of *Eccleſiaſtical Cognizance*, and that it was an inſufferable Preſumption in him to offer to ſend three underling Biſhops to ſit with him in deciding Controverſies; as though he were not the *Univerſal Paſtor* of the *Church* himſelf, *to whom alone by Divine Right* all ſuch things did belong. Such Language as this would have become the *Head of the Church*; and in that indeed he had ſhewn his Authority. But for him ſneakingly to admit other *Biſhops* as *Joint Commiſſioners*, forſooth, with him; and that by the *Emperor*'s Appointment too; What did he elſe but betray the *Rights* of his *See*, and expoſe his *Infallible Headſhip* to great Contempt? Do you think that *Pope Hildebrand*, or any of his *Succeſſors* would have done this? No, they underſtood their Power far better than ſo; and the *Emperor* ſhould have known his own, for offering ſuch an *Affront* to his *Holineſs*. And if his *Bay-leaves* did not ſecure him, the *Thunderbolts* of Excommunication might have lighted on him to his Prejudice. For Shame then never ſay, *That Pope* Miltiades *ſhewed his Authority*; but rather give him over among thoſe *good Biſhops* of *Rome*, but *bad Popes*, who knew better how to ſuffer *Martyrdom*, than aſſert the *Authority* of the *Roman See*. I pray imagine but *Paul 5.* or any other of our ſtout-ſpirited Popes in *Miltiades* his Place, Would they have taken ſuch Things at *Conſtantine*'s Hands as poor *Miltiades* did? and, for all that we ſee, was very well contented too; and thought he did but his Duty in doing what the *Emperor* bid him. Would they have been contented to have had a Cauſe once paſſed the *Infallable Judgment* of the *Roman See*, to be reſumed again, and handled in another *Council*, as though there could be any Suſpicion that all Things were not rightly carried there? And that after all this too, the *Emperor* ſhould undertake to give the final Deciſion to it? Would theſe Things have been born with by any of our *Infallible Heads* of the *Church*? But good *Miltiades* muſt be excuſed, he went as far as his Knowledge Carried him, and thought he might do good Service to the *Church* in what he did; and that was it he looked at more than the *Grandeur* of his *See*. The good Biſhops then were juſt crept out of the *Flames* of Perſecution, and they thought it a great Matter that they had *Liberty* themſelves, and did not much concern themſelves about thoſe *Uſurpations* which the

§. 11.

Pride

Pride and *Eaſe* of the following Ages gave occaſion for. They were ſorry to ſee a *Church* that had ſurvived the cruel *Flames* of *Dioclesian*'s Perſecution, ſo ſuddenly to feel *new ones* in her own Bowels; that a *Church* whoſe Conſtitution was ſo ſtrong as to endure *Martyrdoms*, ſhould no ſooner be at eaſe but ſhe begins to putrifie, and to be *fly-blown* with Heats and Diviſions among her Members; and that her own *Children* ſhould rake in thoſe Wounds, which the Violence of her profeſſed Enemies had cauſed in her; and therefore theſe good *Biſhops* uſed their Care and Induſtry to cloſe them up; and rather rejoyced they had ſo good an *Emperor* who would concern himſelf ſo much in healing the *Church's Breaches*, than diſpute his *Authority* or diſobey his *Commands*. And if *Conſtantine doth expreſs himſelf unwilling to engage himſelf to meddle in a Buſineſs concerning the Biſhops of the Church*, it was out of his tender Reſpect to thoſe *Biſhops* who had manifeſted their Piety and Sincerity ſo much in their late perſecutions, and not from any *Queſtion* of his own Authority in it. For that he after ſufficiently aſſerted, not only in his own Actions, but when the Caſe of *Felix* of *Aptung* was thought not ſufficiently ſcanned at *Rome*, in appointing (about four Months after the Judgment at *Rome*) *Ælianus* the *Proconſul* of *Africa* to examine the Caſe of *Felix* the *Biſhop* of *Aptung*, who had ordained *Cæcilian*. To this the *Donatiſts* pleaded, *That a Biſhop ought not to be tryed by Proconſular Judgment:* to which St. *Auſtin* Anſwers, *That it was not his own ſeeking, but the Emperor's appointing, to whoſe Care and Charge that Buſineſs did chiefly belong, of which he muſt give an Account to God.* And can it now enter into any Head but *yours*, that for all this the *Emperor* looked on the Judgment of this Cauſe as *a Thing not belonging to his Authority?* They who can believe ſuch Things as theſe, and notwithſtanding all the Circumſtances of this Story can think the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtorſhip* was then owned, the moſt I can ſay of them, is, that they are in a fair way to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*; there being nothing ſo improbable, but upon equal Grounds they may judge it true.

Valeſius de Schiſmate Donatiſt cap. 11.

Ait quidam, Non debuit Epiſcopus Proconſulari judicio purgari: quaſi verò ipſe ſibi hoc comparaverit, ac non Imperator ita quæri juſſerit, ad cujus curam de quâ rationem Deo redditurus eſſet, res illa maximè pertinebat. Auguſtin. ep. 162.

Q. 12. P. 170. *That the Pope had no Supremacy over other Patriarchs*, his Lordſhip ſaith, *That, were all other Records of Antiquity ſilent, the Civil Law is Proof enough; And that's a Monument of the Primitive Church. The Text there is*, A Patriarchâ non datur appellatio. *From a Patriarch there lies no Appeal. No appeal, Therefore every Patriarch was alike Supreme in his own Patriarchate. Therefore the Pope then had no Supremacy over the whole Church. Therefore certainly not then received as Univerſal Paſtor.* Two Things you anſwer to this. 1. *That this reacheth not the Difference between Patriarchs themſelves, who muſt have ſome higher ordinary Tribunal, where ſuch Cauſes may be heard and determined.* Very well argued againſt the *Pope*'s Power of Judging: For, in Caſe of a Difference between him and the other *Patriarchs*, who muſt decide the Difference? Himſelf no doubt! But ſtill, it is your way to beg that you can never prove. For you herein ſuppoſe the *Pope to be above all Patriarchs*, which you know is the Thing in diſpute. Or, Do you ſuppoſe it very poſſible, that other Patriarchs may quarrel and fall out among themſelves; but that the Popes are always ſuch mild and good Men, that it is impoſſible any ſhould fall out with them, or they with others; that ſtill they muſt ſtand by as unconcerned in all the Quarrels of the *Chriſtian World*, and be ready to receive Complaints from all Places. If therefore a *General Council* muſt not be the *Judge* in this Caſe, I pray name ſomewhat elſe more agreeable to Reaſon, and the Practice of the *Church*. But you anſwer,

Cod. l. 1. *Tit.* 4. *l.* 29. *Authent. Collat.* 9. *tit.* 15. *c.* 22.

P. 188. n. 4.

anſwer. 2. *What the Law ſaith, is rightly underſtood, and muſt be explicated of inferiour Clerks only, who were not (of ordinary courſe) to appeal further than the Patriarch, or the Primate of their Province. For ſo the Council of* Africk *determines. But 'tis even there acknowledged, that Biſhops had power in their own Cauſes to appeal to* Rome. This anſwer of yours neceſſarily leads us to the Debates of the great Caſe of Appeals to *Rome*, as it was managed between the *African Biſhops*, and the *Biſhops of Rome*, by which we ſhall eaſily diſcover the *weakneſs* of your Anſwer, and the moſt palpable *Fraud* of your Citation; by which we may ſee, What an excellent cauſe you have to manage, which cannot be defended but by ſuch *Frauds* as here you make uſe of, and hope to impoſe upon your Reader by. Your Anſwer therefore in the general is, *That the Laws concerning Appeals, did only concern inferiour Clergy men; but that Biſhops were allowed to appeal to* Rome, *even by the Council of* Africk, *which not only decreed it, but acknowledged it in an Epiſtle to* Pope Boniface. And therefore for our through Underſtanding the Truth in this Caſe, thoſe Proceedings of the *African Church* muſt be briefly explained, and truly repreſented. Two Occaſions the *Churches* of *Africa* had to determine in the Caſe of *Appeals* to *Rome*; the firſt in the *Milevitan*, the ſecond in the *Carthaginian Councils*: In both which we have ſeveral Things very conſiderable to our Purpoſe. In the *Milevitan Council* they decree, *That whoſoever would appeal beyond the Sea, ſhould not be received into Communion by any in* Africa; which Decree is ſuppoſed by ſome to be occaſioned by *Cæleſtius*, having recourſe to Pope *Zoſimus*, after he had been condemned in *Africa*. No doubt, thoſe prudent *Biſhops* began to be quickly ſenſible of the monſtrous Inconvenience which would ſpeedily follow upon the permiſſion of ſuch *Appeals* to *Rome*; for by that means they ſhould never preſerve any Diſcipline in their *Churches*, but every Perſon, who was called in *Queſtion* for any Crimes, would ſlight the *Biſhops* of thoſe *Churches*, and preſently appeal to *Rome*. To prevent which miſchief, they make that *excellent Canon*, which allows only liberty of appealing to the *Councils* of *Africa*, or to the *Primates* of their *Province*, but abſolutely forbids all foreign Appeals. All the Difficulty is, Whether this *Canon* only concerned the *Inferiour Clergy*, as you ſay, (and which is all that the greateſt of your ſide have ſaid in it) or, whether it doth not take away all Appeals of *Biſhops* too. For which we need no more than produce the *Canon* it ſelf, as it is extant in the authentick Collection of the *Canons* of the *African Church*. In which is an expreſs Clauſe, *declaring that the ſame thing had been often determined in the Caſe of Biſhops*. Which, becauſe it ſtrikes home, therefore *Perron* and others have no other ſhift, but to ſay, That this Clauſe was not in the original *Milevitan Canons*, but was inſerted afterwards. But why do not they, who aſſert ſuch bold Things, produce the true authentick Copy of theſe *Milevitan Canons*? That we may ſee, What is genuine, and what not: But, ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that this Clauſe was inſerted afterwards, it will be rather for the Advantage, than Prejudice of our Cauſe. For which we muſt conſider, That in the time of *Aurelius*, *Biſhop* of *Carthage*, there had been very many *Councils* celebrated there: No fewer than ſeventeen *Juſtellus* and others reckon. But a general *Council* meeting at *Carthage*, A. D. 419. (which was about three Years after that *Milevitan Council*, which was held 416. as appears by the Anſwer of *Innocentius* to it, *A. D.* 417.) at the end of the firſt Seſſion they reviewed the *Canons* of thoſe leſſer *Councils*, and out of them all compoſed that *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Africanæ*, as *Juſtellus* at large proves

Concil. Afric. Can. 101. *Epiſt. ad Boniface.*

Item placuit ut Presbyteri, diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores Clerici, in cauſis quas habuerint, ſi de judiciis epiſcoporum ſuorum queſti fuerint, vicini epiſcopi, eos cum conſenſu epiſcopi ſui audiant, & inter eos definiant, adhibiti ab eis epiſcopi: quod ſi & ab iis provocandum putaverint, non provocent ad tranſmarina judicia; ſed ad primates ſuarum provinciarum, aut ad univerſale Concilium; Sicut de Epiſcopis ſæpe conſtitutum eſt. *Ad tranſmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, à nullo intra Africam ad Communionem ſuſcipiatur,* Codex Canon. Eccleſ. African. Can. 28.

proves in the Preface to his Edition of it. So that if this Clauſe were inſerted, it muſt be inſerted then, for it is well known, that the Caſe of *Appeals* was then at large debated; and by that means it received a more general Authority by paſſing in this *African Council*. And hence it was that this *Canon* paſſed with this Clauſe into the *Greek Churches*; for *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* both acknowledge it; and not only they, but many ancient *Latin Copies* had it too, and is ſo received and pleaded by the *Council* of *Rhemes*; as *Hincmarus*, and others, have already proved. But *Gratian* hath helped it well out, for he hath added a brave Antidote at the end of it, by putting to it a very uſeful Clauſe, *Niſi forte Romanam Sedem appellaverit*; by which the *Canon* makes excellent Senſe, that none ſhall appeal to *Rome*, unleſs they do appeal to *Rome*; for none who have any underſtanding of the ſtate of thoſe *Churches* at that time, do make the leaſt Queſtion, but the intent of the *Canon* was to prohibit Appeals to *Rome*; but then, ſay they, They were only the *Appeals of the Inferiour Clergy, which were to be ended by the Biſhops of their own Province.*

§. 13. But this Anſwer is very unreaſonable on theſe Accounts. 1. If Appeals do of right belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, as *Univerſal Paſtor of the Church*, then, Why not the *Appeals* of the *Inferiour Clergy*, as well as *Biſhops*? Indeed, if *Appeals* were challenged only by Virtue of the *Canons*, and thoſe *Canons* limit one, and not the other (as the moſt eager Pleaders for Appeals in that Age, pleaded only the *Canons* of the *Church* for them) then there might be ſome reaſon, Why one ſhould be reſtrained, and not the other; but if they belong to him by *Divine Right*, then all Appeals muſt neceſſarily belong to him. 2. If *Appeals* belong to the *Pope*, as *Univerſal Paſtor*, then no *Council* or Perſons had any thing to do to determine who ſhould appeal, and who not. For this were an uſurping of the Pope's Privilege, for he to whom only *the right of Appeals* belongs, can determine, Who ſhould appeal, and who not; and where, and by whom thoſe Controverſies ſhould be ended. So that the very Act of the *Council* in offering to limit Appeals, implies, that they did not believe any ſuch *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* in the *Pope*; for, had they done ſo, they would have waited his Judgment, and not offered to have determined ſuch Things themſelves. 3. The *Appeals* of the upper and inferiour *Clergy*, cannot be ſuppoſed to be ſeparate from each other. For the Appeal of a *Presbyter* doth ſuppoſe the Impeachment of the *Biſhop* for ſome Wrong done to him, as in the Caſe of *Apiarius*, accuſing *Urban* the *Biſhop* of *Sicca* for excommunicating him. So that the *Biſhop* becomes a party in the *Appeal* of a *Presbyter*. And if *Appeals* be allowed to the *Biſhop*, it is ſuppoſed to be in his Favour, for clearing of his right the better; and if it be denied to the *Presbyter*, it would ſavour too much of Injuſtice and Partiality. 4. The reaſon of the *Canon* extends to one as well as the other, which muſt be ſuppoſed to prevent all thoſe Troubles and Inconveniencies which would ariſe from the liberty of *Appeals* to *Rome*; and, would not theſe come as well by the *Appeals* of *Biſhops*, as of *Inferiour Clergy*? Nay, Doth not the *Canon* inſiſt on that, that no *Appeals* ſhould be made from the *Council* of *Biſhops*, or the *Primates* of *Africa*; but, in caſe of *Biſhops* Appeals, this would be done as well as the other; and therefore they are equally againſt the Reaſon and Deſign of the *Canon*. 5. The Caſe of *Presbyters*, may be as great and conſiderable as that of *Biſhops*, and as much requiring the Judgment of the *Univerſal Paſtor of the Church*. As, for Inſtance, that very Caſe which probably gave occaſion to the *Milevitan Canon*, *viz.* the going of *Cæleſtius* to *Rome*, being condemned of Hereſie in *Africa*: Now, What greater Cauſe could there be made an Appeal to *Rome* in, than in ſo great a matter of *Faith* as that was, about the Neceſſity of *Grace*? And therefore *Petrus de Marcâ* proves at large againſt *Perron*, that in the Epiſtle of

De Concord. Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 7. c. 13. ſect. 6, 7. 9.

Innocent

Innocent to *Victricius*, where it is ſaid, *That the greater Cauſes muſt be referred to the Apoſtolick See*, is not to be underſtood only of the *Cauſes of Biſhops*, but may referr to the *Cauſes* of *Presbyters* too, *i. e.* when they either concern *Matter of Faith*, or ſome *doubtful Piece of Church Diſcipline*. 6. The *Pope*, notwithſtanding this *Canon*, looked on himſelf as no more hindred from receiving the Appeals of *Presbyters*, than thoſe of *Biſhops*. If therefore any Difference had been made by any Act of the *Church*, ſurely the Pope would have remanded *Presbyters* back to their own *Provinces* again; but, inſtead of that, we ſee, he received the Appeal of *Apiarius*. But, for this, a rare Anſwer is given, *viz. that though the Presbyters were forbidden to appeal, yet the Pope was not forbidden to receive them, if they did appeal.* But, to what Purpoſe then were ſuch Prohibitions made, if the Pope might by his open Incouragement of them upon their Appeals to him, make them not value ſuch *Canons* at all; for they knew, if they could but get to *Rome*, they ſhould be received for all them.

§. 14. Notwithſtanding all which hath been ſaid, you tell us, *That in the Council of* Africk *it was acknowledged, that Biſhops had power in their own Cauſe, to appeal to* Rome; for which you cite in your Margent, *part of an Epiſtle of the Council to* Boniface. But, with what honeſty and Integrity you do this, will appear by the Story. *Apiarius* then appealing to *Zoſimus*, he ſends over *Fauſtinus* to *Africa*, to negotiate the Buſineſs of *Appeals*, and to reſtore *Apiarius*, for which he pleads the *Nicene Canons* (an Account of which will be given afterwards) the *Fathers* all proteſt they could find no ſuch thing there, but they agree to ſend Deputies into the *Eaſt*, to fetch the true *Canons* thence (as hath been related already) in the mean time *Zoſimus* dies, and *Boniface* ſucceeds him; but for the better Satisfaction of the *Pope*, the *Council* of *Carthage* diſpatch away a Letter to *Boniface*, to give him an Account of their Proceedings; in which Epiſtle (extant in the *African Code* of *Canons*) after they have given an Account of the Buſineſs of *Apiarius*, they proceed to the Inſtructions which *Fauſtinus* brought with him to *Africa*, the chief of which is that concerning *Appeals* to be made to *Rome*, and then follow thoſe Words which you quote, in which they ſay, *That in a Letter written the Year before to* Zoſimus, *they had granted liberty to Biſhops, to appeal to* Rome; and that therein *they had intimated ſo much to him.* Thus far you are right; but there is uſually ſome Myſtery couched in your *&c.* for you know very well, where to cut off Sentences; for, had you added but the next Words, they had ſpoiled all your foregoing; there being contained in them, the full Reaſon of what went before, *viz. That becauſe the Pope pretended that the Appeals of Biſhops were contained in the Nicene Canons, they were contented to yield that it ſhould be ſo, till the true Canons were produced.* And is this now all their Acknowledgment, that *Biſhops* might in their own Cauſes appeal to *Rome*, when they made only a *Proviſional Decree*, What ſhould be done till the Matter came to a Reſolution? But if you will throughly underſtand what their final Judgment was in this Buſineſs, I pray read their excellent Epiſtle to *Pope Celeſtine*, who ſucceeded *Boniface*; after they had received the *Nicene Canons* out of the *Eaſt*. Which being ſo excellent a Monument of *Antiquity*, and giving ſo great light to our preſent Controverſie, I ſhall at large recite and render it, ſo far as concerns this Buſineſs. *After our bounden Duty of Salutation, we earneſtly beſeech you, that hereafter you admit not ſo eaſily your Ears thoſe that come from hence, and that you admit no more*

Ut Romam liceat Epiſcopis provocare & ut Clericorum cauſæ apud ſuarum provinciarum epiſcopos finiantur, jam priore anno etiam literis noſtris ad eundem venerabilis memoriæ Zoſimum epiſcopum datis, inſinuari curavimus, &c.

Ut ea ſervare ſine ullâ ejus injuriâ pauliſper ſineremus, uſq; ad exquiſitionem ſtatutorum Concilii Niceni.

Præfato itaq; debitæ Salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur, ut deinceps ad veſtras aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis, nec à nobis excommunicates in

communionem ultrà velitis excipere; quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facilè advertet Venerabilitas tua. Nam etsi de inferioribus Clericis vel de Laicis videtur ibi præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de episcopis voluit observari, nè in suâ provinciâ à communione suspensi a tuâ Sanctitate præpropere, vel indebitè videantur communioni restitui. Presbyterorum quoq; & sequentium Clericorum impreba refugia, sicut te dignum est, repellat Sanctitas tua, quia & nullâ Patrum definitione hoc ecclesiæ derogatum est Africanæ, & decreta Nicena sive inferioris gradus Clericos sive ipsos episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissimè commiserunt. Prudentissimè enim justissimeq; viderunt, quæcunq; negotia in suis locis, ubi orta sunt, finienda; nec unicuiq; provinciæ gratiam Sancti Spiritus defuturam: quæ æquitas à Christi Sacerdotibus, & prudenter videatur, & constantissimè teneatur: maximè quia unicuiq; concessum est, si judicio offensus fuerit cognitorum, ad Concilia suæ provinciæ, vel etiam Universale provocare. Nisi forte quisquam est qui credat, uni cuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam; & innumerabilibus congregatis in Concilium Sacerdotibus denegare. Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum judicium ratum erit, ad quod testium necessariæ personæ vel propter sexus, vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis impedimentis adduci non poterunt? Nam ut aliqui tanquam a tuæ sanctitatis latere mittantur, nullâ invenimus Patrum Synodo constitutum. Quia illud quod pridem per eundem coepiscopum Faustinum tanquam ex parte Nicæni Concilii exinde transmisistis, in Concilliis veteribus quæ accipiuntur Nicæni, à S. Cyrillo coepiscopo nostro Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ, & à venerabili Attico Constantinopelitano Antistite, ex authentico missis, qua etiam ante hoc per Innocentium Presbyterum & Marcellum Subdiaconum, per quos ad nos ab iis directa sunt, venerabilis memoriæ Bonifacio episcopo decessori vestro à nobis transmissa sunt, in quibus tale aliquid non potuimus invenire. Executores etiam Clericos vestros quibusq; petentibus nolite mittere, nè fumosum typhum sæculi in Ecclesiam Christi quæ lucem simplicitatis & humilitatis diem Deum videre cupientibus præfert, videamur inducere. Nam de fratre nostro Faustino (ameto jam, pro suis nefandis nequitiis, de Christi Ecclesiâ dolendo Apiario) securi sumus, quod eum probitate ac moderatione tuæ sanctitatis, salvâ fraternâ charitate ulterius Africa minimè patiatur. Concil. Carthag. Epist ad Celestinum.

into Communion, those whom we have cast out: For your Reverence will easily perceive, that this is forbid by the Council of Nice. *For if this be taken care for, as to the Inferiour Clergy and Laity, How much more would it have it to be observed in Bishops; that so they who are in their own Province suspended from Communion, be not hastily or unduly admitted by your Holiness. Let your Holiness also reject the wicked Refuges of Priests and Inferiour Clerks; for no Canon of the Fathers hath taken that from the Church of* Africk; *and the Decrees of* Nice *hath subjected both the Inferiour Clergy, and Bishops, to their Metropolitans. For they have most wisely and justly provided, that every Business be determined in the place where it begun: and that the Grace of the Holy Spirit will not be wanting to every Province, that so Equity may be prudently discovered, and constantly held by Christ's Priests. Especially seeing that it is lawful to every one, if he be offended, to appeal to the Council of the Province, or even to an Universal Council. Unless perhaps that somebody believe that God can inspire to every one of us, the justice of Examination of a Cause, and refuse it to a multitude of Bishops assembled in Council. Or, How can a Judgment made beyond the Sea be valid, to which the Persons of necessary Witnesses cannot be brought, by reason of the Infirmity of their Sex and Age, or of many other intervening Impediments? For this sending of Men to us from your Holiness, we do not find commanded by any Synod of the Fathers. And as for that which you did long since send to us by* Faustinus *our Fellow-Bishop, as belonging to the Council of* Nice, *we could not find it in the truest Copies of the Council, sent by holy* Cyril *our Colleague, Bishop of* Alexandria, *and by the venerable* Atticus *Bishop of* Constantinople: *which also we sent to your Predecessor* Boniface, *of happy Memory, by* Innocent *a Presbyter, and* Marcellus *a Deacon. Take heed also of sending to us any of your Clerks for Executors, to those who desire it, lest we seem to bring the swelling Pride of the World into the Church of Christ, which beareth the Light of Simplicity, and the Brightness of Humility before them that desire to see God. And concerning our Brother* Faustinus (Apiarius *being now for his Wickedness cast out of the Church of Christ) we are confident, that our brotherly Love continuing through the Goodness and Moderation of your Holiness,* Africa *shall no more be troubled with him.*

Thus I have at large produced this noble *Monument* of the *Prudence, Courage* and *Simplicity* of the *African Fathers*; enough to put any reasonable man out of the *fond Conceit* of an *Universal Pastorship* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*. I wonder not that *Baronius* saith, *There are some hard things in this Epistle*, that *Perron* sweats

ſweats and toils ſo much to ſo little Purpoſe, to enervate the force of it; for as long as the Records of it laſt, we have an impregnable Bulwark againſt the *Uſurpations* of the *Church* of *Rome*. And methinks you might bluſh for Shame, to produce thoſe *African Fathers*, as determining the Appeals of *Biſhops* of *Rome*, who, with as much Evidence and Reaſon, as Courage and Reſolution, did finally oppoſe it. What can be ſaid more convincingly againſt theſe *Appeals*, than is here urged by them: That they have neither Authority from *Councils*, nor any Foundation in *Juſtice* and *Equity*; that *God's Preſence* was as well in *Africk* as *Rome* (no doubt then they never imagined any *Infallibility* there) that the Proceedings of the *Roman Biſhop* were ſo far from the *Simplicity* and *Humility* of the *Goſpel*, that they tended only to nouriſh *ſwelling Pride*, and *ſecular Ambition* in the *Church*. That the Pope had no Authority to ſend *Legats* to hear Cauſes, and they hoped they ſhould be no more troubled with ſuch as *Fauſtinus* was. All theſe things are ſo evident in this Teſtimony, that it were a Diſparagement to it to offer more at large to explain them. I hope then, this will make you ſenſible of the Injury you have done the *African Fathers*, by ſaying, That they determined, the Cauſes of *Biſhops* might be heard at *Rome*.

Your Anſwer to the place of S. *Gregory*, which his Lordſhip produceth concerning Appeals, *viz. That the Patriarch is to put a final end to thoſe Cauſes, which come before him by Appeal from Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops*, is the very ſame, that it ſpeaks only of the *Inferiour Clergy*, and therefore is taken off already. *But you wonder his Lordſhip ſhould expoſe to view the following Words of S.* Gregory, *where there is neither Metropolitan, nor Patriarch of that Dioceſe, there they are to have recourſe to the See Apoſtolick, as being the Head of all Churches. Then ſurely it follows, ſay you, the Biſhop of* Rome's *Juriſdiction, is not only over the Weſtern, and Southern Provinces, but over the whole Church, whither the Juriſdiction of Patriarchs and Metropolitans never extended.* See how well you make good the common ſaying, That *Ignorance is the cauſe of Admiration*; for, Wherefore ſhould you *wonder* at his Lordſhips producing theſe Words; if you had either underſtood, or conſidered the abundant Anſwers which he gives to them? 1. *That if there be a Metropolitan, or a Patriarch, in thoſe Churches, his Judgment is final, and there ought to be no Appeal to* Rome. 2. *It is as plain, that in thoſe ancient Times of Church-Government*, Britain *was never ſubject to the See of* Rome (of which afterwards.) 3. *It will be hard for any man to prove, that there were any Churches then in the World, which were not under ſome, either Patriarch or Metropolitan.* 4. *If any ſuch were, 'tis* gratis dictum, *and impoſſible to be proved, that all ſuch Churches, where ever ſeated in the World, were obliged to depend on* Rome. And, Do you ſtill wonder why his Lordſhip produces theſe Words? I may more juſtly *wonder* why you return no Anſwer to what his Lordſhip here ſays. But ſtill the *Caput omnium Eccleſiarum* ſticks with you; if his Lordſhip hath not particularly ſpoken to that, it was, becauſe his whole Diſcourſe was ſufficient to a Man of ordinary Capacity, to let him ſee, that no more could be meant by it, but ſome *Prehemineñce* of that *Church* above others in regard of *Order* and *Dignity*, but no ſuch thing as *Univerſal Power and Juriſdiction* was to be deduced from it. And if *Gregory* underſtood more by it, as his Lordſhip ſaith, 'Tis *gratis dictum*, and *Gregory* himſelf was not a Perſon to be believed in his own Cauſe. But now, as you expreſs it, *his Lordſhip takes a leap from the Church of* Rome, *to the Church of* England: No, neither his Lordſhip, nor we, take a *leap* from thence hither; but you are the Men who *leap* over the *Alps*, from the *Church* of *England*, to that of *Rome*. We plead as his Lordſhip doth truly, *That in the ancient times of the Church*, Britain *was never ſubject to the See of* Rome, *but being one of the*

P. 15. Greg. l. 11. Indict. 6. ep. 54.

P. 171.

P. 188.

Weſtern Dioceſes of the Empire, it had a Primate of its own. This, you
P. 189. ſay, his Lordſhip ſhould have proved, and not meerly ſaid. But, What an unreaſonable man are you, who would put his Lordſhip to prove *Negatives*; if you challenge a Right which the *Pope* hath over us, it is your Buſineſs to prove it; his Lordſhip gave a ſufficient Reaſon for what he ſaid, *in ſaying that* Britain *was one of the Dioceſes of the Empire, and therefore had a Primate of her own.* This you deny not, but ſay, this only proves, *That the Inferiour Clergy could not appeal to* Rome. What again? But this Subterfuge hath been prevented already. But to paſs by what without any Shadow of Proof you ſay *of the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople's *being ſubject to the Pope; and Pope* Urban's *calling* Anſelm *the Patriarch of the other World*; which we are far from making the leaſt ground to make *Canterbury* a *Patriarchal See*; which, as far as concerns the Rights of *Primacy*, was ſo long before the *Synod* of *Bar* in *Apulia*; we come to that which is more material, *viz.* your attempt to prove, *That* Britain *was anciently ſubject to the See of* Rome; for which you inſtance *in* Wilfrid, *Arch-Biſhop of* York, *appealing to* Rome,
Ibid. n. 5. Bed. l. 5. c. 20. *about* A. D. 673. *who was reſtored to his Biſhoprick, by virtue of the Sentence paſſed in his behalf at* Rome; *and ſo being a ſecond time expelled, appealed as formerly, and was again reſtored.* To which I ſhall return you a clear and full Anſwer in the Words of another *Arch-Biſhop*, the late learned *L. Primate of* Ireland. "The moſt famous, ſaith he, (I had almoſt ſaid the "only) Appellant from *England* to *Rome* that we read of before the Con-
Bramhall Juſt. Vindication. c 4. p. 60. "queſt, was *Wilfrid* Arch-biſhop of *York*, who, notwithſtanding that he "gained Sentence upon Sentence at *Rome* in his Favour; and notwithſtand-
'ing that the *Pope* did ſend expreſs *Nuncio's* into *England*, on purpoſe to
'ſee his Sentence executed; yet he could not obtain his Reſtitution or the "Benefit of his Sentence for ſix Years, during the Reigns of King *Egbert*
Spelman. Concil. An. 705. 'and *Alfred* his Son. Yea, King *Alfred* told the Pope's *Nuncios* expreſly,
'*That he honoured them as his Parents for their grave Lives and honourable*
"*Aſpects; but he could not give any Aſſent to their Legation, becauſe it was*
"*againſt Reaſon, that a Perſon twice condemned by the whole Council of the* En-
"gliſh *ſhould be reſtored upon the Pope's Letter.* If they had believed the *Pope* "to be their competent Judge, either as Univerſal *Monarch*, or ſo much as "*Patriarch* of *Britain*, or any more than an honourable *Arbitrator* (which "all the *Patriarchs* were, even without the Bounds of their proper Juriſdi-"ctions) How comes it to paſs that two *Kings* ſucceſſively, and the great "*Councils* of the *Kingdom*, and the other Arch-biſhop *Theodore* with all the "prime *Eccleſiaſticks*, and the Flower of the *Engliſh Clergy*, did ſo long and "ſo reſolutely oppoſe ſo many Sentences and Meſſages from *Rome*, and con-"demn him twice whom the Pope had abſolved? Conſider that *Wilfrid* "was an *Archbiſhop* not an *Inferiour Clerk*; and if an Appeal from *England* "to *Rome* had been proper or lawful in any Caſe, it had been ſo in this Caſe. "But it was otherwiſe determined by thoſe who were moſt concerned. "*Malmsbury* ſuppoſeth, either by *Inſpiration*, or upon his own Head, that the "*King* and the Arch-biſhop *Theodore*, were ſmitten with Remorſe before "their Deaths, for the Injury done to *Wilfrid*, and the ſlighting the Pope's "Sentence, Letter, and *Legats*. But the contrary is moſt apparently true; "for firſt, It was not King *Alfred* alone, but the great *Council* of the *King-*"*dom* alſo; not *Theodore* alone, but the main Body of the *Clergy*, that op-"poſed the *Pope's* Letter, and the Reſtitution of *Wilfrid* in that manner as it "was decreed at *Rome*. Secondly, after *Alfred* and *Theodore* were both "dead, we find the Pope's Sentence, and *Wilfrid's* Reſtitution, ſtill oppoſed "by the ſurviving *Biſhops*, in the *Reign* of *Alfred's* Son. To clear the Matter "paſt Contradiction, let us conſider the ground of this long and bitter Con-

"tention;

" tention ; *Wilfrid* the *Archbiſhop* was become a great *Pluraliſt*, and had " ingroſſed into his Hands too many Eccleſiaſtical Dignities. The *King* and " the *Church* of *England* thought fit to deprive him of ſome of them, and to " confer them upon others. *Wilfrid* appealed from their Sentence to " *Rome*. The Pope gave Sentence after Sentence in favour of *Wilfrid*. But " for all his Sentences, he was not, he could not be reſtored, until he had " quitted two of his Monaſteries which were in Queſtion, *Hongeſtilldean* " and *Ripon*, which of all others he loved moſt dearly, and where he was af- " terwards interred. This was not a Conqueſt, but a plain waving of his " Sentences from *Rome*, and yielding of the *Queſtion* ; for thoſe had been " the chief Cauſes of the Controverſie. So the *King* and the *Church* after " *Alfred*'s Death ſtill made good his Concluſion, That it was againſt Rea- " ſon, that a Perſon twice condemned by the whole *Council* of the *Engliſh*, " ſhould be reſtored upon the Pope's *Bull*. And as he did not, ſo neither " did they give any aſſent to the Pope's *Legation*. This I hope may ſuffice as a moſt ſufficient Anſwer to your Objection from *Wilfride*'s Appeal.

But you would ſeem to urge yet further for the ancient Subjection of *Britain* to the *Church* of *Rome*, in theſe Words, *Again, is it not manifeſt out of him* (Bede), *that even the Primitive original Inſtitution of our Engliſh Biſhops is from* Rome ? And for this you cite a Letter of Pope *Gregory* 1. to *Auguſtine* the *Monk*, whom you call our *Engliſh Apoſtle* ; in which *Gregory grants to him the uſe of the Pall, the proper Badge or Sign of Archiepiſcopal Dignity and that he condeſcended, that he ſhould ordain twelve Biſhops under his Juriſdiction*, &c. *Behold here*, ſay you, *the orginal Charter, as I may ſay, of the Primacy of* Canterbury ; *in this Letter and Mandate of the Pope it is founded ; nor can it with any colour of Reaſon be drawn from other Origin. And by virtue of this Grant, have all the ſucceding Biſhops of that See enjoyed the Dignity and Authority of Primates of this Nation.* From whence you very civilly charge his Lordſhip, *either with groſs Ignorance if he knew it not ; or with great Ingratitude if he knew it.* To which I Anſwer ; that his Lordſhip knowing this no doubt very well, that *Gregory* ſent *Auſtin* into *England*, &c. could not from thence think himſelf bound to ſubmit to the *Roman* Biſhop ; and it had been more pertinent to your purpoſe, not to charge him with *Ingratitude*, but with *Diſobedience*. For that was it which you ought to prove hence, that the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* ought ſtill to be ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*, becauſe *Gregory* 1. *made* Auguſtine *the firſt Archbiſhop of* Canterbury. A wonderful ſtrong Argument no doubt ! which out of Charity to you, we muſt further examine ; for you tell us, *The Original Charter of the Primacy of* Canterbury *is contained in that Grant*. To ſatisfie you as to this, two things are to be conſidered, the Primacy it ſelf, and the *Exerciſe* of it by a particular Perſon in ſome particular Place. If you ſpeak of the Primacy it ſelf, *i. e.* the *independent Right* of Governing the *Churches* within the Provinces of *Britain*, then we utterly deny that this was contained in that Grant. For *Britain* having been a Province before, in which Biſhops did Govern Independently on any Foreign Biſhop, no Foreign Biſhops could take away that Privilege from it. I will not ſtand here to deduce the Hiſtory of the Biſhops of *Britain*, before *Auguſtine*'s coming into *England* ; but it is as certain that there were ſuch, as it is that St. *Auguſtine* ever came hither. For not only all our own Hiſtorians, and *Bede* himſelf confeſs it ; but it is moſt evident from the Subſcriptions of three of them to the *firſt Council* of *Arles*, *Eborius* of *York*, *Reſtitutus* of *London*, and *Adelfius de civitate Coloniâ Londinenſium* (which ſome will have to be a Miſtake for *Colonia Camaloduni*, whether by that, *Colcheſter*, *Maldon*, or *Wincheſter* be meant as it is differently thought) from the Preſence of ſome of them at the

§. 16. *Bed. l. 1. c. 29.* P. 190.

the *Sardican Synod*, and the *Council of* Ariminum, as appears by *Athanasius* and others; but this I suppose you will not deny, that there were Bishops in *England before Austin* came. And, that these Bishops had then no Dependence on the *See* of *Rome*, if it were not sufficiently evident from other Arguments, the Relation of the Proceedings in *Bede* himself, between *Austin* and them, about Submission, would abundantly discover, as likewise, that there was then an Archbishop with *Metropolitical Power* over them, whose ancient Seat had been *Caerleon*. But I consider not this Primacy now as in any particular Place, but in general as belonging to the Provinces of *Britain*, which I say had a Primacy belonging to it, (whether at *York* or *London* is not material) at the time of the *Council* of *Nice* (according to what hath been formerly said about the State of *Churches* then) Now the *Council* of *Nice* takes care *that the Privileges of all Churches should be preserved*, i. e. That where there had been a Primacy, it should so continue. Now therefore I ask, How came this Privilege of *Britain* to be lost, which was not only confirmed with others by the *Nicene Council*, but by that of *Chalcedon* and *Ephesus*, in which the ancient Privileges of Churches are secured? What right had *Austin* the *Monk* to cassate the ancient *Metropolitical Power* of the *Britannick Church*, and to require absolute Subjection to himself? If the Pope made him Archbishop of *Canterbury*, by what Right was he Primate over the *Britain Church*? How came the Archbishop then in being to lose his Primacy by *Austin*'s coming into *England*? Was it because the *Britannick Church* was then over-run with *Pagan Saxons*, and the visible Power of it confined to a narrow Compass? Yet I doubt not, but there were many *British Christians* living here among the *Saxons*, though oppressed by them, as they were after by the *Normans* (for, Where is it that any Conquest hath carried away all the Inhabitants?) and that these did many of them retain their *Christianity*, though not daring publickly to own it, there are many not improbable Circumstances to lead us to suppose. But we will grant that the Face of the *Britannick Church* was only in *Wales*; what follows thence? That the whole Province had lost its Right? Let us suppose a Case like this? As that the *Church* of *Rome* should be over-run with a Barbarous People (as it was by the *Goths* and *Vandals*) and the Inhabitants destroyed; these Barbarous People continuing in Possession of it, and that a Bishop should have been sent from *Britain* to convert them to the Faith, and upon their Conversion to *Govern* those *Churches*, and should be made Bishop of that place by the *British* Bishops, Whether would he be bound to continue always in Subjection to them or no? If not; but you say, *by his Succession in the See of* Rome *he enjoys the Privileges of that See, though the Inhabitants be altered*; the same I say of the *Britannick Churches*, though the Inhabitants were altered, and *Saxons* succeded the *Britains*, yet the Privilege of the *Church* remains still as to its Primacy and Independency. And therefore the Pope's making *Augustine* Archbishop, so as to give him withal the Primacy over the *Churches* in the Province of *Britain*, was an *Usurpation* upon the *Rights* of our *Church*, which had an Absolute and Independent Primacy within it self; as it was in the case of the *Cyprian* Bishop. As supposing those ancient Sects of *Churches* which are over-run with *Turks* should again be converted to *Christianity*, the Bishops of those *Churches*, as of *Ephesus*, or the like, would enjoy the same Rights which the ancient Bishops had; so we say it was in our case, though the Nation was then over-spread with *Paganism*, yet *Christianity* returning, the Privileges of our *Churches* did return with it; and whosoever were rightly consecrated Bishops of them, would enjoy the same *Rights* which they did before. So that *Gregory* might make *Austin* a Bishop, and send him to convert this Nation, by which he was capable to Govern the *Churches* here

which

which he did convert, but he could not give to him the *Right* over these *Churches*, which *Gregory* had no Power over himself; neither could *Austin* or any other Archbishop of *Canterbury* give away the Primacy of *England* by submitting himself to the *Roman See*. What therefore is *Gregory*'s *Grant* to *Austin*, to the Primacy of *England*? If you ask then, How the Archbishops of *Canterbury* come to be Primates of *England*? I Answer, 1. This Primacy must be lodged somewhere; and it is not unalterably fixed to any certain Place, because the Primacy belongs to the *Church*, and not to a particular *See*. 2. It is in the Power of Princes to fix the *Metropolitan See* in what place is judged most convenient; thence have been the frequent Removes of *Episcopal* and *Archiepiscopal Sees*; as is evident in many Examples in *Ecclesiastical History*, particularly in *Justiniana Prima*, made a *Metropolis* by *Justinian*. 3. Where-ever the *Primacy* is lodged, it retains its *ancient Privileges*; so that there is no need of a Succession of our *Archbishops* from the *British Archbishops* of *Caerleon* to preserve the *British* Primacy; but that *See* being removed by the *Power* of *Princes*; the *Primacy* still remains the same, that it was in the *British Metropolitans*. And thus I hope I have shewn you, that the *Original Charter of the Archbishop of* Canterbury's *Primacy*, was not contained in the Pope's grant to *Austin*.

From hence we proceed again to the Case of the *African Churches*; *for* (as his Lordship saith) *the* African *Prelates finding that all succeeding Pope's were not of* Melchiades *his Temper, set themselves to assert their own Liberties, and held it out stoutly against* Zosimus, Boniface 1. *and* Cœlestine 1. *who were successively Bishops of* Rome. *At last, it was concluded in the sixth Council of* Carthage, (*wherein were assembled two hundred and seventeen Bishops, of which St.* Augustine *himself was one) that they would not give way to such a manifest Encroachment upon their Rights and Liberties; and thereupon gave present notice to* Cœlestine *to forbear sending his Officers amongst them, lest he should seem to induce the swelling Pride of the World into the Church of Christ. And this is said to have amounted into a formal Separation from the Church of* Rome; *and to have continued for the space of somewhat more than one hundred Years. For which his Lordship produceth two publick Instruments extant among the ancient Councils; the one an Epistle from* Boniface 2. *in whose Time the Reconciliation to* Rome *is said to be made by* Eulalius, *then Bishop of* Carthage; *but the Separation,* instigante Diabolo, *by the Temptation of the Devil. The other is an* exemplar precum, *or Copy of the Petition of the same* Eulalius, *in which he damns and curses all those his Predecessors, which went against the Church of* Rome. *Now his Lordship urges from hence; Either these Instruments are true, or false. If they be false, then* Boniface 2. *and his Accomplices at* Rome, *or some for them are notorious Forgers, and that of Records of great Consequence to the Government and Peace of the whole Church of Christ, and to the perpetual Infamy of that See, and all this foolishly and to no purpose: On the other side, if these Instruments be true; then 'tis manifest that the Church of* Africk *separated from the Church of* Rome; *which Separation was either unjust, or just; if unjust then St.* Austin, Eugenius, Fulgentius, *and all those Bishops and other Martyrs which suffered in the Vandelick Persecution, died in actual and unrepented Schism, and out of the Church; If it were just, then is it far more lawful for the Church of* England *by a National Council to cast off the Pope's Usurpation, as she did, than it was for the* African *Church to separate; because then the* African *Church excepted only against the Pride of* Rome *in case of Appeals, and two other Canons less material; but the Church of* England *excepts* (*besides this grievance*) *against many Corruptions in Doctrine, with which* Rome *at that time was not tainted. And St.* Austin *and those other famous Men durst not thus have separated from* Rome, *had the Pope had that powerful Principality*

§. 17. P. 172.

over

over the whole Church of Christ. and that by Christ's own Ordinance and Institution, as A. C. *pretends he had.* This is the Substance of his Lordship's Discourse, to which we must consider what Answer you return. Which in
P. 191. short is, *That you dare not assert the Credit of those two Instruments, but are very willing to think them Forgeries; but you say, the Schismatical Separation of the* African *Church from the* Roman, *is inconsistent with the Truth of Story, and confuted by many pregnant and undeniable Instances, which prove that the* Africans, *notwithstanding the Contest in the sixth Council of* Carthage *touching matter of Appeals, were always in true Catholick Communion with the* Roman *Church, even during the Term of this pretended Separation. For which you produce the Testimony of Pope* Cœlestine *concerning St.* Austin, *the Proceeding of Pope* Leo *in the case of* Lupicinus, *the Testimonies of* Eugenius, Fulgentius, Gregory, *and the presence of some* African *Bishops at* Rome. To all which I answer; that either the *African Fathers* did persist in the Decree of the *Council* of *Carthage*, or they did not; if they did persist in it, and no Separation followed; then the casting off the *Usurpations* of the *Roman See* cannot incur the guilt of *Schism*; for these *African* Bishops did that, and it seems continued still in the *Roman Communion*; by which it is evident that the *Roman Church* was not so far degenerated then as afterwards, or that the Authority of those Persons was so great in the *Church*, that the *Roman* Bishops durst not openly break with them, which is a sufficient account of what *Cælestine* saith concerning St. *Austin*, that he lived and died in the Communion of the the *Roman Church.* If you say the Reason why they were in Communion with the *Roman Church* was, because they did not persist; you must prove it by better Instances than you have here brought; for some of them are sufficient Proofs of the contrary. As appears by the case of *Lupicinus* an *Afri-*
Leo. ep. 87. c. 2. can Bishop appealing to *Leo*, who indeed was willing enough to receive him; but what of that? Did not the *African* Bishops of *Mauritania Cæsariensis* excommunicate him notwithstanding that Appeal, and ordained another in his Place; and therefore the Pope very fairly sends him back to be tried by the Bishops of his Province. Which Instance, as it argues the Pope's Willingness to have brought up Appeals among them, so it shews the Continuance of their Stoutness in opposing them. And even Pope *Gregory* so long
Greg. l. 1. ep. 75. after, though in his Time the Business of Appeals was much promoted at *Rome*; yet he dares not challenge them from the Bishops of *Africa*, but yields to them the Enjoyment of those Privileges which they said they had enjoyed from the *Apostles* Times. And the Testimonies of *Eugenius*, and *Fulgentius* imply nothing of Subjection to *Rome*, but a Præeminence which that *Church* had above all others, which it might have without the other; as *London* may I hope be the Head-City of *England*, and yet all other Cities not express Subjection to it. But if after that *Council* of *Carthage* the Bishops of *Rome* did by Degrees encroach upon the Liberties of the *African Churches*, there is this sufficient Account to be given of it; that as the *Roman* Bishops were always watchful to take Advantages to inhance their Power, and that especially when other *Churches* were in a suffering Condition, so a fit Opportunity fell out for them to do it in *Africa*; For not long after that *Council* of *Carthage*, fell out that dismal Persecution of the *African Churches*, by the Irruption of the *Vandals*; in which all the Catholick Bishops were banished out of *Africa*, or lived under great Sufferings; and by a strict Edict of *Genfericus*, no new Bishops were suffered to be ordained in the Places of the former. This now was a fair Opportunity for the Bishop of *Rome* to advance his Authority among the suffering Bishops; St. *Peter*'s pretended *Successor* loving to *fish* in troubled Waters, and it being fatal

fatal to *Rome* from the firſt Foundation of it, to advance her ſelf by the *Ruins* of other Places.

But we are call'd off from the Ruins of other *Churches*, to obſerve the Methods whereby the *Popes* grew great under the *Emperors* which his Lordſhip gives an Account of from *Conſtantine's* time to *Charles* the *Great*, about five hundred Years, which begins thus, *So ſoon as the Emperors became Chriſtian, the Church began to be put in better Order: For the calling and Authority of Biſhops over the Inferiour Clergy, that was a thing of known Uſe and Benefit for Preſervation of Unity and Peace in the Church. Which was confeſſed by S.* Hierom *himſelf, and ſo ſettled in Mens Minds from the very Infancy of the Church, that it had not been to that time contradicted by any. The only Difficulty then was to accommodate the Places and Precedencies of Biſhops, among themſelves, for the very neceſſity of Order and Government. To do this, the moſt equal and impartial way was, that as the Church is in the Common-wealth, not the Common-wealth in it,* (as Optatus *tells us) So the Honours of the Church ſhould follow the Honours of the State; and ſo it was inſinuated if not ordered (as appears) by the Canons of the Councils of* Chalcedon *and* Antioch. *And this was the very Fountain of the Papal Greatneſs; the Pope having his Reſidence in the great Imperial City. But Precedency is one thing, and Authority another; It was thought fit therefore, that among Biſhops there ſhould be a certain Subordination and Subjection. The Empire therefore being caſt into ſeveral Diviſions (which they call'd Dioceſes) every Dioceſe contained ſeveral Provinces, every Province ſeveral Biſhopricks; The chief of a Dioceſe was call'd* Ἐξαρχος, *and ſometimes a Patriarch; the chief of a Province, a Metropolitan; next the Biſhops in their ſeveral Dioceſes (as we now uſe that Word), among theſe there was effectual Subjection reſpectively grounded upon Canon, and Poſitive Law, in their ſeveral Quarters; but over them, none at all: All the Difference there, was but* Honorary *not* Authoritative. To all this part of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe, you only ſay, *That it is founded upon his own conjectural Preſumptions more than upon any thing elſe; and that you have ſhewed a far different Fountain of the Pope's Authority from* Tu es Petrus, & ſuper hanc Petram, *&c.* The meaning of what you ſay, is, That his Lordſhips Diſcourſe hath too much Truth and Reaſon to be Anſwered ſolidly; but becauſe it is againſt the *Pope's* Intereſt you defie him, and croſs your ſelf, and cry, *Tu es Petrus, &c.* and think, this will prevent its doing you any harm. For if we look for one dram of Reaſon againſt it, we muſt look ſomewhere elſe than in your Book, though you tell us, *You have often evidenced the contrary*; but when and where I muſt profeſs my ſelf to ſeek, and I doubt ſhall continue ſo to the end of your Book. But his Lordſhip proceeds. *If the Ambition of ſome particular Perſons did attempt now and then to break theſe Bounds, it is no marvel: For no Calling can ſanctifie all that have it. And* Socrates *tells us, that in this Way the Biſhops of* Alexandria *and* Rome *advanced themſelves to a great height* πόρρω τῆς ἱερωσύνης *even beyond the quality of Biſhops. Now upon view of Story it will appear, that what Advantage accrewed to* Alexandria, *was gotten by the violence of* Theophilus *Patriarch there. A Man of exceeding great Learning and no leſs Violence; and he made no little Advantage out of this, that the Empreſs* Eudoxia *uſed his help for the caſting of St.* Chryſoſtom *out of* Conſtantinople. *But the Roman Prelates grew by a ſteady and conſtant Watchfulneſs upon all Occaſions to increaſe the Honour of that See. Interpoſing and aſſuming to themſelves to be* Vindices Canonum *(as* Greg. Naz. *ſpeaks) Defenders and Reſtorers of the Canons of the Church, which was a fair Pretence and took extreamly well. But yet the World took notice of this their aim. For in all Conteſtations between the Eaſt and Weſt, which were not ſmall, nor few, the Weſtern Biſhops objected Levity to the Eaſtern; and they again arrogancy to the Biſhops of*

P. 18.

P. 175. n. 12.

P. 192.

P. 177.

the West, as Bilius *observes, and upon very warrantable Testimonies. For all this, the Bishop of* Rome *continued in good Obedience to the Emperor, enduring his Censures and Judgments: and being chosen by the Clergy and People of* Rome, *he accepted from the Emperor, the Ratification of that Choice. Insomuch, that about the Year 579. when all* Italy *was on fire with the Lombards, and* Pelagius *the second constrained through the Necessity of the Times, contrary to the Example of his Predecessors, to enter upon the Popedom without the Emperor's leave, St.* Gregory, *then a Deacon, was shortly after sent on Embassie to excuse it.* To all these
P. 193. things you give one general Answer, by calling them *Impertinencies*, which is a general Name for all that you cannot Answer. *The Pope's Obedience to the Emperors you say was constrained, their Ratifications of Pope's Elections only declaring them Canonical,* Socrates *was a Heretick, the Eastern Bishops partial:* This is the Substance of all you say, whereof the two former are manifestly contrary to the Truth of Stories (as, when you desire it may at large be manifested) and the two latter the pitiful Shifts of such who have nothing else to say.

§. 19. But, though you cannot answer Particulars, *you can overthrow his whole Design* (though you cannot *Fiddle*, it seems you can conquer *Cities*. but they
P. 193. n. 9. must be very weak then.) *His main Design*, you tell us, *is to overthrow the Pope's Supremacy, by shewing, it was not lawful to appeal to* Rome; *but Catholick Authors* (to be sure you are in the Number) *frame an unanswerable Argument for his Supremacy, even from the contrary, thus; it was ever held lawful to appeal to* Rome *in Ecclesiastical Affairs, from all the Parts of* Christendom; *therefore, say they, The Pope must needs be Supreme Judge in Ecclesiastical Matters. This is evidenced out of the 4th and 7th Canons of the Council of* Sardica, *accounted anciently an Appendix of the Council of* Nice, *and often cited as the same with it.*

Will you give us leave to come near and handle this *unanswerable Argument* a little? for Persons of your Profession use to be very shy of that. But however, since it is exposed to common view, we may take leave to do it. And seriously, upon Consideration of all the Parts and Circumstances of it, I am of your Mind, without flattering you, that it is *an unanswerable Argument*, but quite to another purpose than you brought it for, even against the Pope's *Supremacy*, as I shall presently discover; so that *those Catholick Authors* have served you just as *Lazarillo* did his blind Master, in bidding him leap over the Water, that he might run his Head full butt against the Tree. For that which your best *Authors* shun as much as may be, and use their best Arts to get besides it, you run blindly, and therefore boldly upon it, as though it were an excellent Argument to your purpose. You say, The Evidence for Appeals, is from the *Canons* of the *Sardican Synod*, but if this be an unanswerable Argument for the Pope's *Supremacy*, 1. How come these *Appeals* to be pleaded from the *Sardican Synod?* 2. How come *these Appeals* to be denied, notwithstanding the *Canons* of it? The former will prove, that the *Supremacy*, if granted from hence, was not acknowledged from *Divine Right*; the latter, that it *was not universally acknowledged by the Church after*; and therefore both of them will make an *unanswerable Argument* against that which you would prove, *viz. the Pope's Supremacy.* First, If the Pope's *Supremacy* be evidenced from hence, 1. How comes it at all to depend on the *Canons?* 2. Why no sooner than the *Canons* of *Sardica?* 3. Why not at all mentioned in them? 1. How comes the Pope's *Supremacy*, if of *Divine Right*, to depend at all upon the *Canons* of the *Church?* We had thought it had been much more to your purpose, not to have mentioned any *Canons* at all of the *Church* about it, but to have produced Evidences, that this was constantly acknowledged as of *Divine Institution.* But we must bear with

with you, in not producing that which is not to be found. For nothing can be more apparent, than that when the Pope's began to perk up, they pleaded nothing but some *Canons* of the *Church* for what they did, as *Julius* to the *Oriental* Bishops, *Zosimus* to the *African*, and so others. If it had been ever thought then, that this *Supremacy* was of *Divine Right*; What senseless Men were these, to make use of the worst Pleas, and never mention the best? For, supposing they had such a *Supremacy* granted them by the *Canons* of the *Church*, Doth not this imply that their Authority did depend upon the *Churches* grant? and, what the *Church* might give for her own Conveniency, she might take it away, when she saw it abused to her apparent Prejudice. And therefore if they had thought that *God* had commanded all *Churches* to be subject to them, it was weakly done of them to plead nothing but the *Canons* of the *Church* for it. 2. Why no sooner than the *Canons* of *Sardica*? Was the *Church* of *Rome* without her *Supremacy* till that time? Will no *Canons* of the *Church* evidence it before them? When this *Council* was not held till eleven Years after the Death of *Constantine*. Had the Pope no right of Appeals till it was decreed here? *Yes*, Zosimus *pleads the* Nicene *Canons for it*: But upon what Grounds, will appear suddenly. 3. Why is not the Pope's *Supremacy* mentioned as the Ground of these Appeals then? Certainly those *Western* Bishops, who made those *Canons*, should have only recognized the *Divine Right* of the Pope's *Supremacy*; and not made a *Canon* in such a manner as they do, that would make any one be confident they never knew the Pope's *Supremacy*. For their Decree runs thus; *That in case any Bishop thought himself unjustly condemned; if it seem good to you, let us honour the Memory of* Peter *the Apostle, that it be written by those who have judged the Cause, to* Julius *the Bishop of* Rome; *and if it seem good, let the Judgment be renewed, and let them appoint such as may take Cognizance of it.* Were these Men mad to make such a *Canon* as this, if they believed the Pope's *Supremacy* of *Divine Institution*? What a dwindling Expression is that, for *the Head of the Church*, to call him *Bishop of Rome* only, when a matter concerning his *Supremacy* is decreeing? And why to *Julius Bishop of Rome*, I pray? Had it not been better to S. *Peter's Successor*, whosoever he be? So it would have been, no doubt, if they had intended a *Divine* or *Universal Right*. And why *for the Honour of* S. Peter's *Memory*? Had it not been more becoming them to have said, *Out of Obedience to Christ's Commands*, which made him *Head of the Church*? And all this come in with an εἰ δοκεῖ, *if it please you*? What, *if it please you*, Whether the Pope should be *Universal Pastor*, or no? *If it please you*, Whether the *Church* should be built *super hanc Petram*, or no? *If it please you*, Whether the Bishop of *Rome* succeeds S. *Peter*, or no? Are these the Men that give such Evidence for the Pope's *Supremacy*? You had better by far never mention them; for if that was the *Lesson* they had to say, never any *Boys* at *School* said their *Lesson* worse than they do. They wanted such as you among them, to have penned their *Canon* for them; and no doubt it had run in a better strain; *For as much as our Lord and Saviour did appoint* S. Peter *Head of the Church, and the Bishop of* Rome *to succeed him as Christ's Vicar upon Earth; these are to let you know that he hath an absolute Power by Divine Right, over all Persons and Causes, and that Men are bound to obey him upon Pain of eternal Damnation.* This had been something like, if you could have found it in some *Canons* of the *Church*; but, to produce a poor sneaking, *If it please you*, What do you else but betray the *Majesty* and *Grandeur*

Εἰ δὲ ἄρα τις ἐπισκόπων ἐν τινὶ πράγματι δόξῃ κατακεῖνεσθαι —— εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῶν τῇ ἀγάπῃ Πέτρου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου τὴν μνήμην τιμήσωμεν, καὶ γραφῆναι παρὰ τούτων τῶν κεινάντων Ἰουλίῳ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμῃ, ὥστε, διὰ τῶν γειτνιώντων τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, εἰ δέοι ἀνανεωθῆναι τὸ δικαστήριον, καὶ ἐπιγνώμονας αὐτὸς παράσχοι. Concil Sardic. c. 3.

of your *Church?* And yet after all this, no such thing as absolute *Appeals* to *Rome* are decreed here neither, but only that the Bishop of *Rome* should have Power to review the case; and in case it was thought necessary, that other Persons should be appointed to examine it. But, How much a *Review* differs from an *Appeal*, and that nothing but a Power to review cases is here given to the Bishop of *Rome*; are fully manifested by *Petrus de Marca*, to whom I again referr you. So that we see from hence you have very comfortable Evidence for the Pope's *Supremacy*.

De Concord. sacerd. & Imp. l. 7. c. 3. sect. 6, 7. &c. l. 7. c. 4. sect. 2.

§. 20. 2. Suppose it had been decreed here, you had not gained much by it; Because, notwithstanding this Decree, *it was far from being acknowledged by the Universal Church.* Which I prove from hence, That the *Sardican Canons* were not received by the *Church:* Nothing can be more evident, than that these *Canons* were not so much as known by the *African* Bishops, when Pope *Zosimus* fraudulently sent them under the Name of the *Nicene Canons*; insomuch that *Cusanus* questions, Whether ever any such thing were determined by the *Sardican Synod* or no: And it appears by S. *Austin*, that the *Council* of *Sardica* was of no great credit in *Africa*; for when *Fortunius* the *Donatist* Bishop would prove, that the *Sardican Synod* had written to some of their Party, because one *Donatus* was mentioned in it; S. *Austin* tells him, It was a *Synod* of *Arrians*; by which it seems very improbable, that they had ever received the Decrees of the *Western*, but only of the *Eastern* part of it, which adjourned to *Philippopolis*. Neither was this ever acknowledged for an *Oecumenical Council*, for although it was intended for *such* by the *Emperors*, *Constans*, and *Constantius*, yet but 70. of the *Eastern* Bishops appeared to 300 of the *Western*; and those *Eastern* Bishops soon withdrew from the other, and decreed things directly contrary to the other. So that *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, as well as the elder *Greeks*, say, The Decrees of it can at most only bind the *Western Churches*; and the arrogating of this Power of reviewing Causes decided by the *Eastern Churches* by *Western* Bishops, was apparently the Cause of the *Divisions* between them; the Eastern and Western Churches being after this divided by the *Alpes Sueciæ*, between *Illyricum* and *Thracia*. And, although *Hilary* and *Epiphanius* expressly call this a *Western Council*, yet it was a long time, before the *Canons* of it were received in the *Western Church*. Which is supposed to be the Reason, Why *Zosimus* would not mention the *Sardican*, but called them the *Nicene Canons*; which *Forgery* was sufficiently detected by the *African* Bishops. And it is the worst of all Excuses, to lay the Blame of it (as you do) on the Pope's *Secretary*; for, Do you think Pope *Zosimus* was so careless of his Business, as not to look over the *Commonitorium*, which *Faustinus* carried with him? Do you think *Faustinus* would not have corrected the Fault when the *African* Bishops boggled so at it? What made him so unwilling that they should send into the *East* to examine the Nicene *Canons*, *but intreated them to leave the business wholly with the Pope*, if he were not conscious of some Forgery in the Business? But, you say, as a further Plea in *Zosimus*'s Excuse, *That the Council of* Sardica *was an Appendix to the Nicene Council rather than otherwise.* An excellent *Appendix*, made at two and twenty Years distance from the other, and called by other *Emperors*, consisting of many other Persons, and assembled upon a quite different Occasion. If this had been an *Appendix* to the *Nicene Council*, How comes that to have but twenty *Canons*? How came *Atticus* and *Cyrillus* not to send these with the other? How come all the Copies of *Councils* and *Canons* to distinguish them? How came they not to be contained in the *Code* of *Canons*, produced in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, in the cause of *Bassianus* and *Stephanus*?

Concord. Cathol. l. 2. c. 15.

Aug. ep. 163.

Contra Cresc. l. 3. c. 34. l. 4. c. 44.

P. 195.

Stephanus? If this were the same Council, because some of the same things were determined. How comes that in *Trullo* not to be the same with the 6 *Oecumenical*? How comes the *Council* of *Antioch* not to be an *Appendix* to the *Council* of *Nice*, if this was, when it was celebrated before this, and the *Canons* of it inserted in the *Code* of *Canons* owned by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*? So that by all the Shifts and Arts you can use, you cannot excuse *Zosimus* from *Imposture* in sending these *Sardican* under the Name of the *Nicene Canons*. And, on what Account the *Pope* falsified the Canons then, is apparent enough, *viz.* for the advancing the *Interest* of his *See*; and this the *African Fathers* did as easily discern afterwards, as we do now. But by this we see, What good *Foundations* the *Pope's* Claim of *Supremacy* had then, and what *Arts* (not to say *Frauds*) they were beholding to for setting it up, even as *great* as they have since made use of to maintain it.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Title of Universal Bishop.

In what Sense the Title of Universal Bishop was taken in Antiquity. A threefold Acceptation of it; as importing 1. *A general Care over the Christian Churches, which is attributed to other Catholick Bishops by Antiquity, besides the Bishop of* Rome, *as is largely proved.* 2. *A peculiar Dignity over the Churches within the Roman Empire. This accounted then Oecumenical, thence the Bishops of the seat of the Empire called Oecumenical Bishops: and sometimes of other Patriarchal Churches.* 3. *Noting Universal Jurisdiction over the whole Church as Head of it, so never given in Antiquity to the Bishop of* Rome. *The ground of the Contest about this Title between the Bishops of* Rome *and* Constantinople. *Of the Proceedings of the Council of* Chalcedon, *about the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Grammatical and Metaphorical Sense of this Title. Many Arguments to prove it impossible that S.* Gregory *should understand it in the Grammatical Sense. The great Absurdities consequent upon it. S.* Gregory's *Reasons proved to hold against that Sense of it which is admitted in the Church of* Rome. *Of* Irenæus *his Opposition to* Victor. Victor's *excommunicating the* Asian *Bishops, argues no Authority he had over them. What the more powerful Principality in* Irenæus *is.* Ruffinus *his Interpretation of the* 6. *Nicene Canon vindicated. The Suburbicary Churches cannot be understood of all the Churches in the Roman Empire. The Pope no Infallible Successour of S.* Peter, *nor so acknowledged to be by* Epiphanius. *S.* Peter *had no Supremacy of Power over the Apostles.*

§. 1.

HIS Lordship having undertaken to give an Account, How the *Popes* rose by degrees to their *Greatness* under the *Christian Emperours*; in prosecution of that, necessarily falls upon the Title of *Universal Bishop* affected by *John* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, and condemned by *Pelagius* II. and *Gregory* I. This you call *a trite and beaten way*, because I suppose the Truth is so plain and evident in it; but withal, you tell us, *This Objection hath been satisfied a hundred times over*; if you had said, the same Answer had been repeated so often over, you had said true; but if you say, that it hath been *satisfied once*, you say more than you are able to defend, as will evidently appear by your very unsatisfactory Answer, which at last you give to it. So that if none of your Party have been any wiser than

your

your self in this matter; I am so far from being *satisfied* with what they say; that I can only pity those Persons, whose Interest sways their Understandings so much (or at least their Expressions) as to make them say any thing that seems to be for their Purpose, though in it self never so senseless or unreasonable. And I can scarce hold my self from saying with the *Orator*, when a like Objection to this was offered him, because Multitudes had said so; *Quasi verò quidquam sit tam valdè, quàm nihil sapere, vulgare*, That Truth and Reason are the greatest *Novelties* in the World. For seriously, Were it possible for Men of common Understanding, to rest satisfied with such pitiful Shifts as you are fain to make, if they would but use any Freedom in enquiring, and any Liberty of judging when they had done? But when once Men have given (not to say sold away) the exercise of their free Reason, by addicting themselves to a particular Interest, there can scarce any thing be imagined so absurd, but it passeth currently from one to another, because they are bound to receive all blindfold, and in the same manner to deliver it to others. By which means it is an easie matter, for the greatest Nonsense and Contradictions *to be said a hundred times over.* And, Whether it be not so in the present case, is that we are now to enquire into. And for the same Ends which you propose to your self, *viz. that all Obscurity may be taken away, and the Truth clearly appear*; I shall in the first Place set down, What his Lordship saith, and then distinctly examine What you reply in Answer to it. Thus then his Lordship proceeds. *About this Time brake out the Ambi-*

P. 178. *tion of* John Patriarch *of* Constantinople, *affecting to be Universal Bishop. He was countenanced in this by* Mauricius *the Emperor, but sowrely opposed by* Pelagius *and S.* Gregory: *Insomuch that S.* Gregory *plainly says, That this Pride*

L. 4 ep. 78. *of his shews that the Times of Antichrist were near. So as yet (and this was near upon the point of six hundred Years after Christ) there was no Universal Bishop: no one Monarch over the whole Militant Church. But* Mauricius *being deposed and murthered by* Phocas; Phocas *conferred upon* Boniface *the Third, that very Honour which two of his Predecessors had declaimed against as monstrous and blasphemous, if not Antichristian. Where, by the way, either these two Popes,* Pelagius *and S.* Gregory *erred in this weighty Business, about an Universal Bishop over the whole Church: Or, if they did not err,* Boniface *and the rest, which after him took it upon them, were in their very Predecessors Judgment Antichristian.* Before you come to a particular Answer, you think it

P. 196 n. 1, 2. necessary to make a way for it, by premising two Things. 1. *That the Title of* Universal Bishop, *was anciently attributed to the Bishops of* Rome; *but they never made use of it.* 2. *That the ancient Bishops of* Constantinople *never intended by this usurped Title, to deny the Pope's Universal Authority, even over themselves.* These two things I shall therefore consider, because they tend much to the clearing the main Controversie. I begin therefore with the Title of *Universal Bishop*, attributed to the Bishop of *Rome*; and before I answer your particular Allegations, we must more fully consider, in what Sense that Title of *Universal Bishop* was taken in *Antiquity*, and in what manner it was attributed to him. For when *Titles* have different Senses, and those senses evidently made use of by the ancient Writers, it is a most unreasonable thing meerly from the Title to infer one determinate Sense, which is the most contrary to the current of *Antiquity*. The Title then of *Universal Bishop*, may be conceived to import one of these three Things. 1. *A general Care and Solicitude over all the Churches of the Christian World.* 2. *A peculiar Dignity over the Churches within the Empire.* 3. *Universal Jurisdiction over all Churches*, so that all exercise of it in the Church is derivative from him as *Universal Pastor and Head of the Church.* This last is that which you attribute to

the

Pope; and though you find the name of *Universal Bishop a hundred Times over*, in the Records of the *Church*, yet if it be taken in either of the two former Senses, it makes nothing at all to your purpose. Our Business is therefore now, to shew, that this Title was used in the Church in the two former Senses; and that nothing from hence can be inferred for that *Oecumenical Pastorship*, which you say, doth, of Divine Right, belong to the Bishop of *Rome*.

§. 2. I begin with the *first*, as this Title may import *a general Care and Solicitude over all the Christian Churches*: and I deny not but in this Sense this Title might be attributed in *Antiquity* to the Bishop of *Rome*; but then I assert, that nothing peculiar to him can be inferred from hence, because Expressions importing the same care, are attributed to other Bishops, especially such who were placed in the greater *Sees*, or were active in promoting the *Church's* Interest. For which we must consider, that Power and Authority in the Bishops of the *Church*, is given with an immediate respect to the good of the *whole Church*; so that if it were possible that every particular Bishop could take care of the *whole Church*, they have Authority enough by their *Function* to do it. But it not only being impossible that every Bishop should do it, but it being inconsistent with Peace and Order, that all should undertake it; therefore it was necessary that there should be some Restraints and Bounds set, for the more convenient Management of that Authority which they had. From hence came the *Original* of particular *Dioceses*, that within such a Compass they might better exercise that Power which they enjoyed. As if many Lights be placed in a great Room, though the Intention of every one of these is to give Light to the *whole Room*; yet that this might the better be done, these Lights are conveniently placed in the several Parts of it. And this is that which S. *Cyprian* means in that famous Expression of his, *That there is but one Bishoprick in the whole World, a part of which is held by every Bishop*; For the *Church* in common is designed as the Diocese of all Bishops, which is set out into several *Appartiments* for the more advantageous governing of it. As a Flock of many thousand Sheep, being committed to the care of many Shepherds, these all have an Eye to the good of the *whole Flock*, but do not therefore sit all together in one Place to over-see it, but every one hath his Share to look after, for the benefit of the *Whole*: But yet so, that upon occasion, one of them may extend his Care beyond his own Division, and may be very useful for the whole, by Counsel and Direction. Thus we shall find it was in the *Primitive Church*; though every Bishop had his particular *Charge*, yet still they regarded the common Good of the whole Church, and upon Occasion did extend their Counsel and Advice far beyond their particular *Churches*; and exercised their Functions in other Places besides those, which the *Church*'s Covenience had alloted to them. Hence it was, that Dissentions arising between the *Asian* and *Roman Churches*, *Polycarp* comes to *Rome*, and there, as *Eusebius* from *Irenæus* tells us, He exercised with *Anicetus* his Consent, his Episcopal Function. For, as *Valesius* observes, it cannot be understood, as *Franciscus Florens* would have it, of his *receiving the Eucharist from* Anicetus, but something of *Honour* is implied in the Word παρεχώρησεν, whereas there was nothing but what was common in the other. Hence the several Epistles of *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, and others, for the advising, confirming, and settling *Churches*. Hence *Irenæus* concerned himself so much in the Business between *Victor* and the *Asian Churches*, either to prevent, or repeal his Sentence of Excommunication against them. Hence S. *Cyprian* writes into *Spain* about the deposing *Basilides* and *Martialis*, two Apostatizing Bishops, and checks *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, for his inconsiderate restoring them. Hence, *Faustus* Bishop of *Lyons* writes to S. *Cyprian*,

Euseb. l. 5. cap. 24.

Not. in l.

Euseb. l. 4. c. 25.

Cyprian. ep. 68.

Cypr. ep. 67.

prian, in the case of *Martianus* of *Arles*, and he writes to *Stephen*, as being nearer, and more concerned in the Business of *Novatianism* (for the Honour of his Predecessors) in order to his Deposition; yet so, as he looks on it as a common Cause belonging to them all (*cui rei nostrum est consulere & subvenire, frater charissime in which they were all bound to advise and help.* Hence S. *Cyprian* writes to the Bishop of *Rome*, as his *Brother* and *Colleague*, without the least Intimation of deriving any Jurisdiction from him, but often expressing *that Charge which was committed to every Bishop, which he must look to as mindful of the Account he must give to God.* Hence *Nazianzen* saith of S. *Cyprian*, *That he not only governed the Churches of* Carthage *and* Africa, *but all the Western Parts, and even almost all the Eastern, Southern, and Northern too, as far as his Fame went.* Hence *Arsenius* writes to *Athanasius*, *We embrace Peace and Unity with the Catholick Church, over which thou, through the Grace of God, dost preside.* Hence *Gregory Nazianzen* saith of *Athanasius*, *That he made Laws for the whole Earth.* Hence S. *Basil* writes to him, *That he had care of all the Churches, as of his own*; and in the same Epistle calls him, *The Head and chief over all.* Hence S. *Chrysostom* in the praise of *Eustathius* the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, saith, *That he was instructed by the Divine Spirit, that he was not only to have care of that Church over which he was set, but of the whole Church throughout the World.* Hence came the great Endeavours of *Theophilus* and *Cyril*, Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, of *Eusebius Vercellensis*, *Hilarius Pictaviensis*, and several others, for rooting out of Heresies; not confining themselves to those *Provinces* alloted to them, but extending their care over other *Churches.* Hence came frequent Ordinations of Persons out of their own *Dioceses*, as of *Paulinus* at *Antioch* by *Lucifer Calaritanus*, of many Bishops in *Syria* and *Mesopotamia* by *Eusebius Samosatenus*; and of a *Presbyter* at *Bethleem* by *Epiphanius*; who when he was quarrelled at by *John* of *Hierusalem* for it, he defends his Action by his saying, That, *In Sacerdotio Dei nulla est diversitas, i. e.* where-ever a Bishop was, he might exercise his Power as such, although the *Churches* Prudence had set Limits to their ordinary Jurisdiction. From these Things then we see, that a general *Care* and *Solicitude* of the *Universal Church*, doth belong to every Bishop, and that some of them have been expressly said to have had the care of the *whole Church*, which in other Terms is to say, *They were Universal Bishops.* So that from this Sense of the Title, you gain nothing to your purpose, though the care of the *Universal Church* be attributed to the Bishop of *Rome*, though he acts and calls *Councils*, and *orders* other things out of his own *Province*, yet all this proves not the *Supremacy* you intend; for this is no more than other Bishops did, whom you will not acknowledge to be *Heads* of the *Church*, or *Universal Bishops* in that Sense.

Nazian. Orat. 18 p. 281.

Athanas. Ap. ad Imp. Const. p. 786. Tom. 1.

Nazianz. Orat. 21. p. 392.

Basil. ep 52. Tom. 3. p. 79.

Chrysost. Tom. 5. p. 631. ed. Savil.

Hieron ep. 71. Ruffin. l. 11. c. 27, 30, 31.

Theodoret. l. 5. c. 4.

Hieron. ep. 60.

§. 3. 2. An *Universal Bishop* denotes *a peculiar Dignity over the Churches within the* Roman *Empire*: For which, two things will be sufficient to manifest it. 1. That the *Roman Empire* was then accounted *Universal.* 2. That *some Bishops in the Great Churches*, were on that account called *Oecumenical or Universal Bishops.* 1. That the *Roman Empire* was then accounted *Universal*; for which Multitudes of Testimonies might be cited, in which *orbis Romanus*, and *orbis Humanus* were looked on as *Synonymous*; thence *Trebellius Pollio* in *Macrianus, qui ex diversis partibus orbis Romani restituant*: and as *Salmasius* witnesseth in those Writers of the *Imperial History*; most of the ancient *M S S.* for *orbis Romanus* have *orbis Humanus*; for, as he saith, *Eâ gloriâ fuerunt Romani, ut totum orbem suum vocarent; hinc orbis Romanus passim apud auctores reperitur pro universo orbe*; thence they called the *Roman People, Omnium gentium victorem*; and from hence *Ammianus*

Not. in Hist. August p. 306.

nus Marcellinus calls *Rome*, *caput Mundi* (the head of the World) and the *Roman Senate*, *Asylum mundi totius* (the Sanctuary for the whole World;) thence *Spartianus* saith of *Severus*, *orbem terrarum Romamque despexit*, when, as *Casaubon* observes, he speaks only of the *Roman Provinces*. And from hence, whatever was out of the *Roman Empire*, was called *Barbaria*, thence the *rura vicina Barbariæ* in *Lampridius*, for the *Marches* which lay next to the Enemies Country; thence *Marcellinus*, *visus est in Barbarico miles*, and in the *Imperial Constitutions*, as *Justellus* observes, *Barbari vocantur*, *quicunque Imperio Romano non parebant* (all were called barbarous out of the *Roman Empire*) and in the same Sense *barbaricum* is used in the 58th. *Canon* of the *African Code*, and in the 206th. *Canon* of the *Code of the Universal Church*, that the Bishops ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς, *i. e. out of the Roman Empire*, should be ordained by the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*. Now, since the *Roman Empire* was called *orbis Romanus*, and in *Greek*, ἡ οἰκουμένη, (as appears, in that *Augustus*, *Luk.* 2. 1. is said to tax πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, *the whole World*, which could be only the *Roman Empire*; and the famine in the same, is said to be ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, *Act.* 11. 28.) it is no wonder if those *Bishops* who enjoyed the greatest Dignity in the *Roman Empire* were called *Oecumenical*; and those *Councils* so too, which consisted of the Bishops within those Bounds. I come therefore to the second thing, That *some Bishops* in the *Great Churches* in the *Roman Empire*, were called *Oecumenical*, as that relates to *the* ἡ οἰκουμένη, *viz.* the *Roman Empire*. For which we may consider, the primary Ground of the Advancement of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, was the *greatness of the City*, as is undeniably manifest by the Proceedings of the *Councils* of *Constantinople*, and *Chalcedon* about him; wherein it was decreed, since that was *New-Rome*, that it should enjoy *equal Privileges with the old*. And in all Probability the Ground of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*'s usurping the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* was but to correspond with the *Greatness* of his *City*, which at the Time of the Contest between Pope *Gregory*, and him, was in a better Condition than *Rome* it self; being the Seat of the *Empire*, and therefore he thought it suitable thereto, to be called *Oecumenical Patriarch*. But besides this Peculiarity of *Constantinople*, it was no unusual thing for the Bishop of the *Patriarchal Churches*, to have Expressions given them, tantamount to the Title of *Universal Bishop* in any Sense but that of the *Universal Jurisdiction*; which I shall prove as to the *three Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Constantinople*. First, Of *Alexandria*: So *Greg. Nazianzen* saith of *Athanasius*, being made Bishop there, *he had the Government of that People committed to him, which is as much as to say, of the whole World*; *and* John *of* Hierusalem, writing to *Theophilus Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, saith, *That he had the care of all the Churches*. And St. *Basil* writes to *Athanasius* about the establishing of *Meletius* as Patriarch of *Antioch*, *that so he might govern as it were the whole Body of the Church*. But most clear and full to that purpose is the Testimony of *Theodoret* concerning *Nestorius* being made Patriarch of *Constantinople*. *He was intrusted with the Government of the Catholick Church of the Orthodox at* Constantinople, *and thereby of the whole World*. What work would you make with so illustrious a Testimony in *Antiquity* for the Bishop of *Rome* as this is for the Patriarch of *Constantinople*? Use therefore and interpret but these Testimonies as kindly as you do any for the

Amm. Marcel. l. 14. l. 16.

Spartian. in Severo.

Lamprid. in Alex. Sev. Marcel. l. 18. Justel. Not. in Cod. Afric. Can. 58.

Cod. Eccles. Uni. Can. 06. & ibi Justel.

Τὴν τοῦ λαοῦ προεδρίαν πιστεύεται, ταυτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν τῆς οἰκουμένης πάντης ἐπιστασίαν. Nazianzen. 21. p. 377.

Tu quidem ut homo Dei & Apostolicâ ornatus gratiâ curam omnium Ecclesiarum sustines. Apud Hieronym. ad Pammach. To. 2. ep. 61. c. 15.

Καὶ τὸ τοῦ πάντος, ὡς εἰπεῖν, σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτὸν προστάναι. Basil. ep. 50.

Τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων, καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν προεδρίαν πιστεύεται, οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης. Theodoret. hæret. fabul. l. 4. c. 12. p. 245. To. 4. oper.

the *Roman See*, and will you not find as large a Power over the *Church* attributed to the other *Patriarchs* as you do to the Bishop of *Rome*? What is it then you would infer from the Title of *Universal Bishop* being attributed to him? Will the very Title do more than what is signified by it? Or must it of Necessity import something more when given to the *Bishop* of *Rome* than it doth when given to other *Bishops*? If it doth, you must prove it from some other Arguments, and not barely from the Title being attributed to them. Thus you see, though the Title were granted to be attributed to him, there is nothing new, nothing peculiar in it.

§. 4. P. 196. But we must further examine, Who they are that attribute this Title to him, and what the Account is of their doing it. For this, you cite *the Council of* Chalcedon *in a Letter inserted in the Acts of it, the Council of* Constantinople sub Menna, John *Bishop of* Nicopolis, Constantinus Pogonatus *the Emperour*, Basil *the younger, and* Balsamon *himself.* To the first I Answer, 1. That this Title was not given by the *Council of Chalcedon*. 2. If it had, no more was given to the *Bishop of Rome*, than to the *Bishops* of other *Patriarchal Churches*. 1. That this Title was not given by the *General Council of Chalcedon*; this I know *Gregory* I. in his *Epistles* about this Subject, repeats *usque ad nauseam, That the Title of Universal Bishop was offered to the Bishop of* Rome *by the Council of* Chalcedon *and that he refused it*; but there is as little Evidence for the one as the other. That the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* was attributed to the Bishop of *Rome* by some Papers read and received in that *Council*, I deny not, but we must consider the Persons who did it, and the occasion of it. The Persons were such who came to inform the *Council* against *Dioscorus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and they were no other than *Athanasius* a Presbyter, *Theodorus* and *Ischyrion* two *Deacons*, and *Sophronius* a *Laick* of *Alexandria*: Now these Persons not in a Letter (as you relate it) but in their *Bills* exhibited to the *Council* against *Dioscorus* give that Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or *Archbishop* to *Leo* the Bishop of *Rome*. And is this now the Offer made of the Title of *Universal Bishop* by the *Council of Chalcedon*? But you say, *This was inserted into the Acts of the Council*? I grant it was, but on what Account? Not with any respect to the *Title*, but as containing the *Accusations* against *Dioscorus*. But where do any of the Bishops of that *Council* attribute that Title to *Leo*? Which of them mentions it in their *Subscriptions* to the Deposition of *Dioscorus*, tho' many of them speak expresly of *Leo* and *Anatolius* together with the same Titles of Honour to them both? Why did not the *Council* superscribe their *Synodical Epistle* to *Pope Leo* with that Title? So indeed *Binius* rather supposes they should have done, than proves they ever did it? And that only from *Gregory*'s Epistle (not *Leo*'s as he mistakes it) to *Eulogius* where he mentions this Offer, but upon what Grounds we have seen already. But suppose, 2. We should grant, that the *Council of Chalcedon* should have offered the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or *Bishop*, to the Bishop of *Rome*; there are none who understand any Thing of the Nature of that Title, or the Proceedings of that *Council*, who can imagine they should intend any Acknowledgment of the *Pope's Supremacy* by it. For the Title it self as to the Importance of it was common to other Bishops, especially of the *Patriarchal Sees*, as I have proved by some Instances already, and might do yet by more; but I shall content my self with the ingenious Confession of *Sim. Vigorius*; *That when the Western Fathers, call the* Roman *Bishops, Bishops of the Universal Church, they do it from the Custom of their*

Concil. Chalced. Act. 3. part. 3. p. 243.

Bin. not. in Chalced. Con Tom. 3. Concil. p. 562.

Et harum rerum ignari Audabatæ nostri, non advertunt, cum Occidentales Patres, Pontifices Romanos vocant, universales Ecclesiæ

their Churches, not that they look on them as Universal Bishops of the whole Church, but in the same Sense that the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, *are called so; or as they are Universal over the Churches under their Patriarchate; or that in Oecumenical Councils they preside over the whole Church.* And after acknowledgeth, that the Title of *Universal* or *Oecumenical Bishop* makes nothing for the Pope's *Monarchy* in the *Church.* And if it doth not so when given by the *Western Fathers*, much less certainly when given by the *Eastern*, especially those who met in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*; For it is evident by their 16 *Session*, the 28 *Canon*, and their *Synodical Epistle* to Pope *Leo*, they designed the Advancement of the *See* of *Constantinople* to *equal Privileges with that of* Rome. And therefore if they gave the Pope the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, or *Bishop*, it was that he might be willing that the *Patriarch of* Constantinople might be called so too. And if, as *Gregory* saith, the *Bishops of* Rome *would not accept the Title of Universal Bishop*, the truest account I know of it, is, lest the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* should share with him in it; but we see when the great *Benefactor* to your *Church*, the *Benign Phocas*, as *Gregory* himself stiles him, gave it to the Bishop of *Rome alone*, then *Hands* and *Heart*, and all were ready to receive it. And I much fear *Leo* 1. and St. *Gregory* himself would have been shrewdly tempted to receive it, if it had been offered them upon those Terms, that no one else should have it besides them; but they scorned it till they could have it alone. And for all their Declamations against the *Pride* of *Anatolius* and *John*, *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople*, they must look very favourably on the Actions of those two Popes, that discern not their own *Pride* in condemning of them for it. For usually Men shew it as much in suspecting or condemning others for it, as in any other way whatsoever. Thus it was in these Persons; they thought the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* proud and arrogant, because they sought to be equal with them. But, Was it not their own greater *Pride*, that they were able to bear no *Equals*? and it is to be feared, it was their Desire to advance their own *Supremacy*, which made them quarrel so much with *Anatolius*, and *John*, and *Cyriacus*. For would they but have been contented to truckle under the *Roman* Bishops they had been accounted very meek and humble Men. And St. *Gregory* himself, would not sure have thought much to have called them so, who most abominably flatters that Monster *Phocas*, after the Murder of *Mauricius* and his *Children*: for he begins his *Epistle* to him with, *Gloria in excelsis Deo: Glory to God on high, who, according to what is written, changes Times and transfers Kingdoms:* and after, in such notorious flattering Expressions congratulates his coming to the *Throne*, that any one who reads them would think *Phocas* the *greater Saint*; he rejoices, *that the Benignity of his Piety was advanced to the Imperial Throne, nay* (lætentur cœli & exultet terra) *let the Heavens rejoyce and the Earth be glad, and all the People which have been hitherto in much Affliction, revive at the Benignity of your Actions.* O rare *Phocas!* Could he do any less than pronounce the Bishop of *Rome Universal Bishop* after this, when poor *Cyriacus* at *Constantinople* suffered for his opposing him for the Execrable Murder of his *Master*? Therefore these Proceedings of *Leo* and *Gregory* yield shrewd Matter of Suspicion, what the main Ground of their Quarrel against the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* was. For before, the *Emperors* stood up for the Honour of *Constantinople*, as being the *Seat* of their *Empire*, and *Rome* began to sink, the *Em-*

Episcopos, id more suarum Ecclesiarum facere, & eâ notione, non quod patent totius orbis universalis, universales esse Episcopos, sed eâdem quâ Constantinopolitanus, Alexandrinus, Antiochenus, Hierosolymitanus, dicuntur Universales: aut ut universales Ecclesiarum quæ sunt sub eorum Patriarchatu: aut quod in Conciliis Oecumenicis toti Ecclesiæ præsint. Vigorius Comment. ad Resp. Synodal. Concil. Basil. p. 36.

Greg. l. 11. ep. 36. Ind. 6.

pire decaying there; but now, there was a fit time to do something for the *Honour* of the *Roman See*; *Cyriacus* was in Disgrace with the *Tyrant Phocas*; and no such time as now to fall in with him and caress him; and we see *Gregory* did it pretty well for a *Saint*, but he lived not to enjoy the Benefit of it; but *Boniface* did however.

§. 5. After the *Patriarchate* of *Constantinople* was erected, the *Popes* had a double Game to play, to advance themselves, and depress that, which it was very hard for them to do, because all the *Eastern Bishops*, as well as the *Emperour* favoured it. But after *equal Privileges* were decreed to the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* with the *Bishop* of *Rome*, by the *Council* of *Constantinople*, they could no longer dissemble their Choler; but had no such occasion ministred to them to express it as after the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, (wherein were present 630 *Bishops*) which confirmed the former. For then *Leo* fumes and frets and writes to *Martianus*, and *Pulcheria*, to *Anatolius* and the *Bishops* of the *East*; but still pretends that he stood up for the *Privileges* of the other *Patriarchs* and the *Nicene Canons*, and what not? But one might easily discern what it was that pinched him, *viz.* the *equalling* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* with himself. Which it is apparent he suspected before, by the Instructions he gave his *Legats Paschasinus* and *Lucentius*, to be sure to oppose whatever was proposed in the *Council* concerning the *Primacy* of that *See*. And accordingly they did; and complained that the *Canon* was *surreptitiously* made. Which they were hugely overseen in doing while the *Council* sat, for upon this the whole matter is reviewed, the *Judges* scan the Business, the *Bishops* protest there were no Practices used; that they all voluntarily consented to it; and all this in the Presence of the *Roman Legats*? How comes it then to pass that this should not be a regular and conciliar Action? Were not the Bishops at Age to understand their own *Privileges*? Did not the Bishop of *Antioch* know his own *Interest* as well as *Pope Leo*? Must he be supposed more able to understand the *Nicene Canons* than these 630 Bishops? Why then was not this *Canon* as *regular* as any other? Why forsooth, *The Pope did not consent to it.* So true is that sharp Censure of *Ludovicus Vives*, that, *those are accounted lawful Canons and Councils which make for their Interest, but others are no more esteemed than a Company of tatling Gossips.* But what made the *Pope* so angry at this *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*? He pretends the Honour of the *Nicene Canons*, the preserving the *Privileges* of other *Patriarchs*; But *Binius* hath told us the true Reason of it; *because, they say, that the Primacy of* Rome *came, by its being the seat of the Empire; and therefore not by Divine right; and since* Constantinople *was become the Seat of the Empire too, therefore the Patriarch there should enjoy equal Privileges with the Bishop of* Rome. If *Rome* had continued still the sole *Seat* of the *Empire*, this Reason would not have been quarrelled at; but now *Rome* sinking and *Constantinople* rising, this must not be endured; but all the Arts and Devices possible must be used to keep it under. And this is the true Account of the *Pique* which the Bishops of *Rome* had to the *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople*: From whence we may easily guess how probable it is that this *Council* of *Chalcedon* did acknowledge the *Pope Oecumenical Bishop* in any other Sense than they contended the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* was so too. And the same Answer will serve for all your following Instances. For, as you pretend that the *Council* of *Constantinople* sub Menna *did call Pope* Agapetus *Oecumenical Patriarch*, so it is most certain that it call'd *Mennas*

Itaque illa demum eis videntur edicta & concilia quæ in rem suam faciunt, reliqua non pluris, stimanda quam conventum mulierciularum in textrinâ vel thermis. Lud. Vives in Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 20. cap. 26.

Bin. not. in Chalced. Con. p. 561.

Mennas the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* ſo too. And which is more, *Adrian* 1. in his Epiſtle to *Tharaſius* of *Conſtantinople* in the ſecond *Nicene Council*, calls him *Univerſal Biſhop*. If therefore the *Greek Emperors* and *Balſamon* call the Pope ſo, they import nothing peculiar to him in it, becauſe it is moſt evident they call'd their own Patriarch ſo likewiſe. So that you find little Advantage to your Cauſe from this firſt thing which you premiſe, *viz.* that the Pope was anciently called *Univerſal Biſhop*. But you ſay further. 2. *That the Biſhops of* Conſtantinople *never intended to deny by this uſurped Title, the Pope's Univerſal Authority even over themſelves.* This is ambiguous, unleſs it be further explained what you mean by *Univerſal Authority*; for, it may either note ſome kind of *Præ-eminence* and *Dignity* which the Biſhop of *Rome* had as the chief Patriarch, and who on that account had great *Authority* in the *Church*, and this your Inſtances prove, that the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* did acknowledge to belong to the Pope: but if by *Univerſal Authority* be meant *Univerſal Juriſdiction over the Church, as appointed the Head of it by Chriſt*, then not one of your Inſtances comes near the Shadow of a Proof for it. P. 196 n. 2.

Thus having conſidered what you premiſe, we come to your Anſwer it ſelf. For which you tell us, *We are to take notice, that the Term* [*Univerſal Biſhop*] *is capable of two Senſes; the one Grammatical, the other Metaphorical. In the Grammatical Senſe it ſignifies Biſhop of the Univerſal Church, and of all Churches in particular even to the Excluſion of all others from being properly Biſhops; and conſequently diſplaceable at his Pleaſure; as being only his, not Chriſt's Officers; and receiving Authority from him, and not from Chriſt. In the Metaphorical Senſe, it ſignifies only ſo high and eminent a Dignity above all other Biſhops throughout the whole Church, that though he, who is ſtiled Univerſal Biſhop, hath a true and real Superintendency, Juriſdiction, and Authority over all other Biſhops, yet that they be as truly and properly Biſhops in their reſpective Provinces and Dioceſes as he himſelf. This being cleared* (ſay you) *'tis evident that St.* Gregory *when he inveighs againſt the Title of Univerſal Biſhop, takes it in the Literal and Grammatical Senſe*; which you very faintly endeavour to prove out of him, as I ſhall make it preſently appear. This being then the Subſtance of that Anſwer which you ſay hath been given *a hundred times over*, muſt now *once* for all paſs a ſtrict and ſevere Examination. Which it ſhall receive in theſe two Enquiries, 1. Whether it be poſſible to conceive that St. *Gregory* ſhould take *Univerſal Biſhop* in the Literal and *Grammatical* Senſe? 2. Whether all the Arguments which he uſeth againſt that Title, do not hold againſt that *Univerſal Juriſdiction* which you attribute to the Pope as *Head of the Church*? §. 6. P. 197. n. 3. N. 4.

1. Whether it be poſſible to conceive that St. *Gregory* ſhould take *Univerſal Biſhop* in the *Literal and Grammatical Senſe* which you give of it? And he which can think ſo, muſt have ſome other way of underſtanding his meaning than by his Words and Arguments, which I confeſs I do not pretend to. But if we examine them, we ſhall find how impoſſible it is that St. *Gregory* ſhould ever think that *John* pretended to be the ſole Biſhop of this World. 1. Becauſe *Gregory* ſaith, *That ſame Title which* John *had uſurped was offered to the* Roman *Biſhops by the Council of* Chalcedon, *but none of them would ever uſe it, becauſe it ſeemed to diminiſh the Honour of other Biſhops.* Now I pray think with your ſelf, whether ever 630 Biſhops would conſent together to give away all their Power and Authority in the *Church*? For you ſay, *The Literal Senſe of Univerſal Biſhop doth ſuppoſe him to be Biſhop of all particular Churches, to the Excluſion of all others from being properly Biſhops, and are all diſplaceable at his Pleaſure.* Can it now enter into Greg. ep. l. 4. ep. 32.

your

your Mind, that *Gregory* should ever think that these Bishops should all make themselves the Pope's *Vassals* of their own free Choice? We see even under the great *Usurpations* of the Bishop of *Rome* since, though they pretend (for all that I can see) to be *Oecumenical* Bishops in a higher Sense than ever *John* pretended to, that yet the Bishops of the *Roman Communion* are not willing to submit their Office wholly to the *Papal Jurisdiction*; witness the stout and eager Contests of the *Spanish* Bishops in the *Council* of *Trent*, about the *Divine Institution of the Episcopal Office*, against the Pretences of the *Italian* Party. And shall we then think when the Pope was far from that Power which he hath since Usurped, that such a Multitude of grave and resolute Bishops should throw their *Miters* down at the Pope's *Feet*, and offer him in your *literal Sense*, to be *sole Bishop of the World?* That they would relinquish their Power, which they made no Question they had from *Christ*, and take it up again at the Pope's *Hands?* But whether you can imagine this of so many Bishops or no, Can you conceive that *Gregory* should think so of them? and he must do it, if he took the Title of *Universal Bishop* in your *literal Sense*; and yet this *Gregory* saith, *Hoc Universitatis nomen oblatum est, That very Name of Universal Bishop was offered to the Pope by the Council of* Chalcedon; Sed nullus unquam Decessorum meorum hoc tam profano Vocabulo uti consensit. Nothing then can be more plain, than that *John* took that which the Pope refused. And he that can believe that this Title should ever be offered in this literal Sense, I despair without the help of *Physick* to make him believe any thing. 2. This very Title was not usurped wholly by *John* himself, but was given him in a *Council* at *Constantinople*. This *Gregory* confesseth in his Epistle to *Eulogius* and *Anastasius* the Patriarchs of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, *that about eight Years before, in the time of* Pelagius *his Predecessor*, John *called a Council at* Constantinople *in which he endeavours to be called Universal Bishop*; so *Gregory*: but he confesseth elsewhere that he effected it. And it appears by the Epistle of *Pelagius* himself writ on that Occasion, that it was more than a *meer Endeavour*, and that they did consent to it; else, Why doth *Pelagius* say, *Quicquid in vestro conventiculo statuistis*, Whatever they had determined in their Conventicle (as on this account *Pelagius* calls it, because it wanted his Approbation)? And it is evident from *Gregory*'s zealous Writing to the other Patriarchs about it, that they did not look on themselves as so much concerned about it. Now in this *Council* which met at *Constantinople*, which was called together in the case of *Gregory* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, all the Patriarchs either by themselves or *Substitutes* were present, as *Evagrius* tells us, and not only they but several *Metropolitans* too; now if they had taken this in the *literal Sense*, Can you think they would have yielded to it? Were not they much more concerned about it than either *Pelagius* or *Gregory* were? For they were near him, and were sure to live under this usurped Power of his, and to smart by it, if it were so great as you suppose it to be. But it is apparent by their yielding to it, they looked on it, to be sure, not in the *literal Sense*, and it may be as no more than the *Honorary Title* of *Oecumenical Patriarch*.

Greg. l. 4. ep. 36.

Ibid.

Greg. ep. l. 4. ep. 34.

Pelag. 2. *ep.* 8. *apud Bin. T.* 4. *Concil.*

Evagr. hist. l. 6. *c.* 7.

§. 7. 2. How comes it to pass, that none of the *Successors* of *John* and *Cyriacus* did ever challenge this Title in the *Literal Sense* of it? For we do not see that they quitted it, for all *Phocas* gave it to Pope *Boniface*, since by your own Confession in the *Greek Canon-Law*, *Sisinius*, *German*, *Constantine*, *Alexius*, *and others are called Oecumenical Patriarchs:* And it appears by the Epistles of *Pelagius* and *Gregory*, that was the *Title* which *John* had then given him. *Si summus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris denegatur,*

Ibid.

denegatur, saith *Pelagius*. *Si enim hoc dici licenter permittitur, honor Patriarcharum omnium negatur*, saith *Gregory*. From which Words I think it most probable, that the main Ambition of the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, was not meerly that they would be called *Oecumenical Patriarchs*, but that Title should properly belong to them, as excluding others from it, which was it that touched the Bishops of *Rome* to the *quick*; because then *Constantinople* flourished, as much as *Rome* decayed by the Oppressions of the *Lombards*; and *Gregory* complained of this to *Constantia* the *Empress*, that for seven and twenty Years together they had lived in *Rome*, *inter Longobardorum gladios* (*among the Swords of the Lombards*) and this made them so jealous, that the Honour of the *Roman See* was then sinking, and therefore they stickle so much against this Title, and draw all the invidious Consequences from it possible, the better to set the other Patriarchs against it; and because that would not extend far beyond the Patriarchs themselves, they pretend likewise, that this was to make himself *Universal Bishop*. But not certainly in your *Literal Sense*; for then *Gregory* would have objected some *Actions* consequent upon this Title; in depriving Bishops of their *Jurisdiction, and displacing some, and putting in others at his Pleasure*; which you say, is the natural effect of this *Literal Sense* of *Universal Bishop*. But we read of nothing of this Nature done either by *John* or *Cyriacus*; they acted no more than they did, only enjoyed a higher Title. And this is proved further,

L. 4. ep. 34.

4. By the carriage of the *Emperor Mauricius* in this Business. *Gregory* writes a pitiful moaning Letter to him about it, and uses all the *Rhetorick* he had to perswade the *Emperor*, that he would either *flectere*, or *coercere*, *incline, or force him* to lay aside that arrogant Title: But for all this it appears by *Gregory*'s Letter to the *Empress*, *That the Emperor had checked him for meddling in it*, and was so far from opposing the Patriarch's Title, that in effect *he bid him trouble himself no more about it*: Which poor S. *Gregory* took very ill. And afterwards, when *Cyriacus* succeeded *John* in *Constantinople*, the *Emperor* being somewhat fearful, lest *Gregory* at the coming in of a new Patriarch, might, on the account of this new Title, deny his *Communicatory Letters*, he dispatches a *Letter* to him to quicken him about it. And he takes it very unkindly that the *Emperor* should suspect his *Indiscretion* so much, that for the sake of this *Title*, *which* he saith, *had sorely wounded him, he should deny Communion in the Faith with him*; and yet in the same Epistle saith, *That whosoever took the Title of Universal Bishop upon him, was a Forerunner of Antichrist*. But if this Name had been apprehended in that which you call, *The Literal and Grammatical Sense*, Would not the *Emperor* (being commended by *Gregory* too for his *Piety*) have rather encouraged him in it? Whereas he plainly tells him, *It was a Contest about a frivolous Name, and nothing else; and that there ought to be no Scandal among them about it*. Upon which *Gregory* is put to his Distinctions of two sorts of *frivolous Things*, *some that are very harmless, and some that are very hurtful*, i.e. frivolous Things are either such as are frivolous, or such as are not; for, Who ever imagined, that such Things as are very hurtful, are *frivolous*? But however, S. *Gregory* speaks excellent Sense; for his meaning is, that the *Title* it self may be *frivolous*, but the *Consequences* of it may be dreadful, and so we have found it since his time. So that this appears to be the true State of the Business between them; the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, he challengeth the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch* or Bishop, as belonging of right to him,

Triste mihi aliquid serenissimus Dominus innuit, quod non eum corripuit qui superbit, sed me magis ab intentione meâ declinare studuit, Greg. l. 4. ep. 34.

Greg. l. 6. ep. 30.

De quâ re mihi in suis jussionibus pietas præcepit dicens, ut pro appellatione frivoli nominis inter nos scandalum generari non debeat. Greg. ibid.

Sed rogo ut imperialis pietas penset, quia alia sunt frivola valdè innoxia, alia valdè nociva. Ibid.

him, being Patriarch of the *chief Seat* of the *Empire*, but in the mean time challengeth no *Universal Jurisdiction* by virtue of this Title: On which account the *Emperor* and *Eastern Bishops* admit of it: On the other side, the Bishops of *Rome*, partly looking at their own *Interest* in it (for so it appears by one of *Gregory*'s Epistles to the *Emperor*, that he suspected it to be his own *Interest* which he stood so much up for) and partly foreseeing the dangerous *Consequence* of this, if *Universal Jurisdiction* were challenged with it, they resolutely oppose it, not meerly for the *Title* sake, but for that which might follow upon that *Title*, taking it not in your *Literal*, but in your *Metaphorical Sense*, as I shall shew presently. But neither Party was so weak and silly, as to apprehend it in your *Literal Sense*; for then neither would the *Emperor* have slighted it, nor the Popes opposed it on those Terms which they do, and on such Grounds which reach your *Metaphorical Sense*.

Nunquid ego hâc in re piissime Domine propriam causam defendo? nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? Id. l. 4. ep. 32.

5. The *same Title* in the *same Sense* which *Gregory* opposed it, did *Boniface* accept of, from the *Emperor Phocas*. This you confess your self, when you say, *That all that* Phocas *did, was but to declare that the Title in contest did of right belong to the Bishop of* Rome *only*; therefore the same Title which the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* took to himself before, was both given by *Phocas*, and taken by Pope *Boniface*. This then being confessed by you, let me now seriously ask you, Whether the *Title* of *Universal Bishop*, which Pope *Gregory* opposed, was to be taken in the *Grammatical* or *Metaphorical Sense*? Take now, Whether of them you please; if in the *Metaphorical*, all his Arguments hold against the Pope's *present Universal Jurisdiction*, by your own Confession; if in the *Literal* and *Grammatical*, then Pope *Boniface* had all those Things belonging to him, which *Gregory* condemns that Title for. Then by your own Confession Pope *Boniface* must be *the Forerunner of Antichrist*, he must *equal himself to* Lucifer *in Pride*, he must have that *Name of Blasphemy* upon him, and all those dreadful *Consequences* must attend him and all his Followers, who own that Title of *Universal Bishop*, in that which you call the *Litteral* or *Grammatical Sense* of it.

P. 199. n. 5.

6. Lastly, It appears from S. *Gregory* himself, that the *Reasons* which he urgeth against the Title of *Universal Bishop*, are such as hold against that which you call the *Metaphorical Sense* of it; which in short is, *An Universal Pastor exercising Authority and Jurisdiction over the whole Church*. And it is scarce possible to imagine, that he should speak more clearly against such an *Universal Headship* than he doth; and urges such Arguments against it, which properly belong to that *Metaphorical Sense* of it. As when he saith to *John* the *Patriarch*, *What wilt thou answer to Christ the Head of the Universal Church in the Day of Judgment, who dost endeavour to subject all his Members to thee, under the Name of Universal Bishop?* What is there in these Words which doth not fully belong to your *Metaphorical Sense of Head of the Church?* Doth he not subject all *Christ's Members to him?* Doth he not challenge to himself *proper Jurisdiction over them?* What then will he be able to answer *to Christ the Head of the Universal Church*, as St. *Gregory* understands it *exclusive* of any other? Doth not he *arise to that height of Singularity, that he is subject to none, but rules over all?* yet these are the very Words he uses; and, Can any more expressly describe your *Head of the Church* than these do? Yet herein he saith, *He imitates the Pride of* Lucifer, who, according to St. *Gregory*, endeavoured

Tu quid Christo Universalis sc. Ecclesiæ capiti, in extremi judicii examine dicturus es, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? Greg. l. 4. ep. 38.

Ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli subesse & solus omnibus præesse videretur. Id. ib.

red to be the *Head of the Church Triumphant*, as the *Pope of the Church Militant*. And follows that parallel close, *That an Universal Bishop imitates* Lucifer *in exalting his Throne above the Stars of God: For* (saith he) *What are all the Brethren the Bishops of the Universal Church, but the Stars of Heaven?* And after Parallels them with the *Clouds*, and so this *terrestrial Lucifer ascends above the Heights of the Clouds*. And again, saith he, *Surely the Apostle* Peter *was the first Member* (not the Head) *of the Holy and Universal Church. Paul, Andrew,* and *John, What are they else but the Heads of particular Churches? And yet they are all Members of the Church under one Head.* Can any thing be more clear against any *Head* of the *Universal Church, but Christ himself?* When St. *Peter* is acknowledged to be only a *prime Member* of the *Church*; How then come his Successors to be the *Heads* of it? And, as he goes on, *The Saints before the Law, under the Law, and under Grace, who all make up the Body of our Lord, they were all but Members of the Church, and none of them would be called Universal.* And, I pray, let his *Holiness* consider his following Words, *Let your Holiness acknowledge what Pride it is to be called by that Name, which none that was truly holy was ever call'd by.* And, Do you think now that these Expressions do not as properly reach your *Head of the Church*, as if they had been spoken by a *Protestant* against that Doctrine which you all own? What is there in all this, that implies that others should be *no Bishops*, but only *Titular*? Yes, they may be as much Bishops as you acknowledge them to be, *i. e. as to their power of Order, but not as to their Jurisdiction.* For this, you say and defend, comes from the *Head* of the *Church*; or else your *Monarchical Government* in the *Church* signifies nothing. Do not you make the *Pope Universal Pastor of the Church*, in as high a Sense as any of these Expressions carry it? And when St. *Gregory* urges so often, *That if there be such an Universal Bishop, if he fails, the Church would fail too*; Do you deny the Consequence as to the Pope? Doth not *Bellarmine* tell us, when he writes of the Pope, he writes *de summa rei Christianæ, Of the main of all Christianity*, and surely then the *Church* must fail if the Pope's *Supremacy* doth? And I pray now consider with your self, Whether this Answer which you say *hath been given a hundred times over*, can satisfie any reasonable Man? Nay, Doth it not appear to be so absurd and incongruous, that it is matter of just Admiration, that ever it should have been given *once*; and yet you are wonderfully displeased that his Lordship should bring this Objection upon the Stage again. But, Do you think your Answers, like your *Prayers*, will do you good by being said *so often over*? Indeed therein they are alike, that they are both in an *unknown Tongue*. Your *Literal Sense* of *Universal Bishop* being in this case no more intelligible than your *Latin Prayers* to a Country Congregation.

Quid enim fratres tui omnes Universalis Ecclesiæ Episcopi, nisi astra cœli sunt? Ib.

Certè Petrus Apostolus primum membrum sanctæ & universalis Ecclesiæ est. Paulus, Andreas, Joannes, quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita? Et tamen sub uno capite omnes sunt membra Ecclesiæ. Ibid.

Vestra autem Sanctitas agnoscat, quantum apud se tumeat, quæ illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus præsumpsit, qui veraciter sanctus fuit. Ibid.

These things being thus clear, I have prevented my self in the second *Enquiry*, in that I have proved already, that the *Reasons* which St. *Gregory* produceth hold against that Sense of *Universal Bishop*, which you own and contend for, as of right belonging to the *Bishop* of *Rome*. Although it were no difficult matter to prove, that, according to the most received Opinion in your *Church*, *viz. that all Jurisdiction in Bishops is derived from the Pope* (which Opinion you cannot but know is most acceptable at *Rome*, and was so at the *Council* of *Trent*) that that which you call the *Literal Sense*, doth follow your *Metaphorical*, *i. e.* If the Pope hath *Universal Jurisdiction* as

§. 9.

Head of the *Church*, then other *Bishops* are not properly *Bishops*, nor *Christ's Officers, but his.* For what doth their *Power* of *Order* signifie as to the *Church* without the *Power* of *Jurisdiction?* And therefore, if they be taken only *in partem solicitudinis*, and not *in plenitudinem potestatis*, according to the known distinction of the *Court* of *Rome*, it necessarily follows, that they are but the *Pope's Officers*, and are taken just into so much Authority as he commits to them, and no more. And this *Bellarmine* proves from the very *Form* of the Pope's Consecration of *Bishops*, whereby he commits *the Power of governing the Church to him, and the Administration of it in Spirituals and Temporals.* And you may see by the Speech of *Father Laynez*, in the *Council of Trent*, how stoutly he proves that the *Power of Jurisdiction was given wholly to the Bishop of* Rome, *and that none in the Church besides hath any spark of it but from him; that the Bishop of* Rome *is true and absolute Monarch, with full and total Power and Jurisdiction, and the Church is subject unto him, as it was to Christ. And, as when his Divine Majesty did govern it, it could not be said that any of the faithful had any the least Power or Jurisdiction, but meer, pure, and total subjection; so it must be said in all Perpetuity of time, and so understood, that the Church is a Sheepfold and a Kingdom. And, that he is the Only Pastor, is plainly proved by the Words of Christ, when he said, he hath other Sheep which he will gather together, and so one Sheepfold should be made, and one Shepherd.* What think you now of the *Literal Sense* of *Universal Bishop*, for the *Only Bishop?* Are not the *Only Bishop*, and the *Only Pastor* all one? Will not all those Words of St. *Gregory* reach this, which any of you make use of to prove, that he takes it in the worst and Literal Sense? nay, it goes higher. For *Gregory* only argues, that from the *Title* of *Universal Bishop* he must be *sole Bishop*, and others could not be any *True Bishops*; but here it is asserted in plain Terms, that the *Bishop of* Rome *is the only Pastor*, and that as much as if *Christ himself* were here upon Earth, and therefore if your *Literal Sense* hath any *Sense* at all in it, it is much more true of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, than ever it could be of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople.* And therefore I pray think more seriously of what he saith, *That to agree in that prophane Word, is to lose the Faith;* * *That such a blasphemous Name should be far from the Hearts of Christians, in which by the Arrogance of one Bishop, the Honour of all is taken away.* Neither will it serve your turn to say (which is all that you have to say) that this is not the *definitive Sentence of your Church*, but that many in your *Church* hold otherwise, That there is *Power of Jurisdiction properly in Bishops.* For, although these latter are not near the Number of the other, nor so much in favour with your *Church*, but are looked on as a *discontented Party*, as appears by the Proceedings in the *Council of* Trent; yet that is not it we are to look after, What all in your *Church* are agreed on, but what the Pope challengeth as belonging to *himself.* Was not Father *Laynez* his Doctrine highly approv'd at *Rome*, as well as by the *Cardinal Legates* at *Trent*, and all the Italian Party? Were not the other Party discountenanced and disgraced as much as might be? Doth not the Pope arrogate this to himself, to be *Oecumenical Pastor*, and the *sole Fountain* of all *Jurisdiction* in the *Church?* If so, all that ever S. *Gregory* said against that *Title*, falls most heavily upon the Pope. For, S. *Gregory* doth not stand upon what others attributed to him, but what he arrogated to himself, that therein, *he was the Prince of Pride, the Forerunner of Antichrist, using a vain, new, rash, foolish, proud, prophane, erroneus, wicked, Hypocritical, singular, presumptuous, blasphemous Name.* For all these goodly *Epithets* doth S. *Gregory*

Bellarm de Pontif. l. 4. cap. 24. Hist. Concil. Trid. l. 7. p. 611.

Greg. l. 4. ep. 34. l. 7. ep. 69.

Consentire in hoc scelesto vocabulo, est fidem perdere. Greg. l. 4. ep. 39

* *Absit à cordibus Christianorum nomen istud Blasphemiæ, in quo omnium Sacerdotum honor admittitur, dum ab uno sibi dementer arrogatur.* l. 4. ep. 32.

Greg. l. 4. Ep. 32, 34, 38, 39. l. 6. Ep. 2. 24.

S. *Gregory* bestow upon it; and, I believe, if he could have thought of more, and worse, he would as freely have bestowed them. If therefore *John* the Patriarch was said by him to *transgress God's Laws, violate the Canons, dishonour the Church, despise his Brethren, imitate Lucifer*, How much more doth this belong to him, that not only challengeth to be *Oecumenical Patriarch*, but the *sole Pastor* of the *Church*, and that all *Jurisdiction* is derived from him? And by this time I hope you see, that the Answer you say hath been given a *hundred Times over*, is so pitifully weak, absurd and ridiculous, that you might have been ashamed to have produced it *once*, and much more to repeat it without saying any more for it than you do. For, your other Discourse depends wholly upon it, and all that being taken away, the rest doth fall to the Ground with it.

We must now therefore return to his Lordship's Discourse, in which he goes on to give an account of the rise of the Pope's *Greatness*. "As yet, saith "he, The right of *Election*, or Ratification of the Pope, continued in the "*Emperor*: but then the *Lombards* grew so great in *Italy*, and the *Empire* was "so infested with *Saracens*, and such Changes happened in all Parts of the "World, as that neither for the present, the Homage of the Pope was useful "for the *Emperor*; nor the Protection of the *Emperor* available for the "Pope. By this means the Bishop of *Rome* was left to play his own Game "by himself. A thing which as it pleased him well enough, so both he and "his Successors made great Advantage by it. For, being grown to that *Emi-*"*nence* by the *Emperor*, and the greatness of *that City* and Place of his A-"bode; he found himself the more free, the greater the *Tempest* was, that beat "upon the other: And then first he set himself to alienate the Hearts of the "*Italians* from the *Emperor*. Next he opposed himself against him. And "about *A. D.* 710. Pope *Constantine* 1. did also first of all openly confront "*Philippicus* the *Emperor*, in defence of *Images*, as *Onuphrius* tells us. After "him *Gregory* 2. and 3. did the same by *Leo Isaurus*. By this Time the "*Lombards* began to pinch very close, and to vex on all Sides, not *Italy* "only, but *Rome* also. This drives the Pope to seek a new *Patron*. And "very fitly he meets with *Charles Martell* in *France*, that famous Warrior "against the *Saracens*. Him he implores in Defence of the *Church* against "the *Lombards*. This Address seems very advisedly taken, at least it proves "very fortunate to them both: For in short time it dissolved the *Kingdom* "of the *Lombards* in *Italy*, which had then stood two hundred and four Years, "which was the Pope's Security. And it brought the *Crown* of *France* into the "House of *Charles*, and shortly after the *Western Empire*: And now began "the Pope to be great indeed. For by the Bounty of *Pepin*, Son of *Charles*, "that which was taken from the *Lombards*, was given to the Pope. So that "now of a Bishop, he became a *Temporal Prince*. But when *Charles* the "*Great* had set up the *Western Empire*, then he resumed the ancient and ori-"ginal Power of the *Emperor*, to govern the *Church*, to call Councils, to or-"der *Papal Elections*. And this Power continued in his Posterity. For this "right of the *Emperor* was in force and use in *Gregory* the seventh's time, "who was confirmed in the Popedom by *Henry* the fourth, whom he after-"ward deposed. And it might have continued longer, if the succeeding "*Emperors* had had Abilities enough to secure or vindicate their own Right. "But the Pope keeping a strong *Council* about him, and meeting with some "weak *Princes*, and they oft-times distracted with great and dangerous "Wars, grew stronger till he got the better. So this is enough to shew, How "the Popes climbed up by the *Emperors*, till they over-topt them, which is all "I said before, and have now proved. And this was about the Year 1073. "Yet was it carried in succeeding Times with great Changes of Fortune and

§. 10. P. 179.

" different Success. The *Emperor* sometimes plucking from the Pope, and " the Pope from the *Emperor*, winning and losing Ground, as their Spirits, " Abilities, Aids, and Opportunities were, till at the last the Pope settled " himself upon the Grounds laid by *Gregory* 7. in the great Power which he " now uses in and over these Parts of the Christian World. To all this you return a short Answer, in these Words; *We deny not but that in Temporal Power and Authority the Pope's grew great by the Patronage of Christian Emperors. But what is this to the purpose? If he would have said any thing material, he*

P. 200. *should have proved that the Popes rose by the Emperor's means to their Spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction over all other Bishops throughout the whole Catholick Church; which is the only thing they claim* jure Divino, *and which is so annexed to the Dignity of their Office by Christ's Institution, that, were the Pope deprived of all his Temporalties, yet could not his Spiritual Authority suffer the least Diminution by it.* But 1. Doth his Lordship's Discourse only contain an account of the *Pope's temporal Greatness by the Patronage of Christian Emperors?* Doth he not plainly shew, How the *Popes* got their Power by *rebelling*, and *contesting* with the *Emperors* themselves, How they assumed to themselves a Power to depose *Emperors:* and, Do they claim these things *jure Divino* too? 2. What you say of the Pope's *Spiritual Authority*, will then hold good when it is well proved; but bare asserting it, will never do it. We must therefore have Patience till you have leisure to attempt it.

§. 11. But in the mean time we must consider, How you vindicate the *famous place* of *Irenæus*, concerning, as you say, *the Pope's Supreme Pastoral Authority*, from his Lordship's Interpretation. Yet, before we come to the *Authority* it self, there are *some light Skirmishes* (as you call them) to be passed through; and those are, concerning *Irenæus* himself. For his Lordship

P. 181. n. 13. saith, *That his Adversary is much scanted of ancient proof, if* Irenæus *stand alone; besides,* Irenæus *was a Bishop of the Gallican Church, and a very unlikely Man to captivate the Liberty of that Church under the more powerful Principality of* Rome. *And how can we have better Evidence of his Judgment, touching that Principality, than the Actions of his Life? When Pope* Victor *excommunicated the* Asian *Churches,* ἀθρόως, *all at a blow, was not* Irenæus *the chief Man that reprehended him for it? A very unmeet and undutiful thing sure it had been in* Irenæus, *in deeds to tax him of Rashness and Inconsiderateness, whom in Words* A. C. *would have to be acknowledged by him, the Supreme and Infallible Pastor of the Universal Church.* To which you Answer,

P. 201. n. 6. 1. *To the Liberty of the* Gallican *Church: As if (forsooth) the so much talked of Liberties of the* Gallican *Church, had been things known or heard of in St.* Irenæus *his Time*; as though there were no difference between not captivating the *Liberty of that Church to* Rome, and asserting the *Liberties of the* Gallican *Church* in her Obedience to *Rome*, yet these two must be confounded by you to render his Lordship's Answer ridiculous; which yet is as sound and rational as your Cavil is vain and impertinent. But this you pass over and fix 2. *Upon his reprehending Pope* Victor, *where* (you say) *that* Eusebius *hath not a word importing Reprehension, but rather a friendly and seasonable Perswasion: his Words are* προτρεπόμενος παραινεῖ, *&c. he exhorts him after a handsome manner, as reflecting on the Pope's Dignity, and clearly shews that the Pope had of right some Authority over the* Asian *Bishops and by consequence over the whole Church. For otherwise it had been very absurd in St.* Irenæus *to perswade Pope* Victor, *not to cut off from the Church so many Christian Provinces, had he believed (as Protestants contend he did) that the Pope had no Power at all to cut them off. Just as if a Man should entreat the Bishop of* Rochester, *not to excommunicate the Archbishop of* York *and all the Bishops of his Province;*

Province, over whom he hath not any the least Pretence of Jurisdiction. I Answer, that if you say, that *Eusebius hath not a Word importing Reprehension*, it is a sign you have not read what *Eusebius* saith. For, doth not he expressly say, *That the Epistles of some of the Bishops are yet remaining, in which they do severely rebuke him? Among whom* (saith he) *Irenæus was one, &c* It seems, *Irenæus* was one of those Bishops who did *so sharply reprehend him*; but it may be, you would render πληκτικώτερον καθαπτόμενον *kissing his Holiness Feet*, or, *exhorting him after a handsome manner*; and indeed, if they did it sharply, they did it πρεπόντως *suitably* enough to what *Victor* deserved for his rash and inconsiderate Proceedings in this Business. But withal to let you see how well these Proceedings of his were resented in the Christian World, *Eusebius* tells us before, *That* Victor *by his Letters did declare those of the Eastern Churches to be excommunicate:* and he presently adds, *But this did no ways please all the Bishops*; wherefore (ἀντιπαρεκελεύοντο) *they counterman-ded him, that he might mind the things of Peace and Unity, and Brotherly Love* And will you still render that Word too, by *exhorting him after an handsome manner*, when even *Christopherson* renders it by *magnoperè adhortabantur*, *Valesius* by *ex adverso hortati sunt*? And although these seem not to come up to the full *Emphasis* of the Word, yet surely they imply somewhat of *Vehemency* and *Earnestness* in their perswading him as well as their being hugely dissatisfied with what *Victor* did. I grant *that these Persons did reflect* (as you say) *on the Pope*, but not as you would have it *on his Dignity*, but *on his Rashness and Indiscretion*, that should go about to cast the *Asian Churches* out of Communion, for such a Trifle as that was in Controversie between them. But you are the happiest Man at making Inferences that I have met with: for, *because* Irenæus *in the Name of the* Gallican *Bishops, writes to* Victor, *not to proceed so rashly in this Action*; *thence you infer, that the Pope had of right some Authority over the* Asian *Bishops, and by Consequence over the whole Church.* Might you not every Jot as well infer, that when a Man in Passion is ready to kill those that stand about him; whoever perswades him not to do it, doth suppose he might lawfully have done it, if he would? But if those Bishops had so venerable an Esteem (as you would perswade us they had) then of the Bishop of *Rome*, How come they to dispute his Actions in so high a manner as they did? If they had looked on him as *Universal Pastor of the Church*, it had more become them to sit still and be quiet, than severely to reprehend him who was alone able to judge what was fit to be done and what not in those Cases. If the Pope had call'd them to *Council* to have known their Advice, it might have been their Duty to have given it him in the most humble and submissive manner that might be. But for them to intrude themselves into such an *Office*, as to advise the *Head* of the *Church* what to do in a matter peculiarly concerning him, as though he did not know what was fit to be done himself; methinks you should not imagine that these Men did act πρεπόντως as *became them*, in doing it. Could they possibly in any thing more declare, how little they thought it necessary for all *Churches* to conform to that of *Rome*, when they plead for Dissenters in such a matter which the Pope had absolutely declared himself about? And how durst any of them slight the *Thunderbolts* which the Pope threatned them with? Yet not only *Polycrates* and the *Asian* Bishops who joined with him profess themselves not at all affrighted at them; but the other *Churches* looked not on themselves as obliged to forsake their Communion on that Account. If this be such an Evidence of the Pope's *Power* in one *Sense*,

Φέρονται γὰρ καὶ τέτων φωναὶ πληκτικώτερον καθαπτομένων τε Βίκτορος, ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ Εἰρηναῖος, &c. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

Ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶσί γε τοῖς ἐπισκόποις τοῦτ' ἤρεσκετο, ἀλλ' ἀντιπαρεκελεύοντο αὐτῷ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον εὐσταθείας καὶ ἀγάπης φροντίζειν. Euseb. ibid.

sense, I am sure it is a greater Evidence of his *Weakness* in another: It seems the *Head* of the *Church* began betimes to be troubled with the *Fumes* of *Passion*; and it is a little unhappy, that the first *Instance* of his *Authority* should meet with so little regard in the Christian World. If the *Pope* did begin to assume so early, you see it was not very well liked of by the Bishops of other *Churches*. But it seems he had a mind to try his *Power* and the weight of his Arm; but for all his haste, he was fain to withdraw it very patiently again. *Valesius* thinks that he never went so far as to excommunicate the *Asian* Bishops at all, but the noise of his threatning to do it being heard by them, (it seems the very preparing of his *Thunderbolts* amazed the World) *Irenæus* having call'd a *Synod* of the Bishops of *Gaul* together, doth in their name write that *Letter*, in *Eusebius*, to *Victor* to dissuade him from it, and that it wrought so effectually with him, that he gave it over. And this he endeavours to prove, 1. Because *Eusebius* saith, he only endeavour'd to do it. But *Cardinal Perron* supposeth *Eusebius* had a worse meaning than so in it; *i. e.* that *though the Pope did declare them excommunicate, yet it took no Effect because other Bishops continued still in communion with them*; and therefore he calls *Eusebius* an *Arrian* and an Enemy to the *Church* of *Rome*, when yet all the Records of this Story are derived from him. 2. Because the Epistles of *Irenæus* tend to perswade him not to cut them off; whereas, if they had been excommunicate, it would have been rather to have restored them to Communion; and that *Photius* saith, that *Irenæus* writ many Letters to *Victor* to prevent their Excommunication. But because *Eusebius* saith expresly, *That he did by Letters pronounce them out of the Communion of the Church*, the common Opinion seems more probable, and so *Socrates* understands it; but still I am to seek for such an Argument of the Acknowledgment of the Pope's Authority then, as you would draw from it. *Yes*, say you, *because they do not tell him, He had no Authority to do what he did; which they would have done if they could without proclaiming themselves Schismaticks* ipso facto *and shaking the very Foundation of the Churches Discipline and Unity*. But all this proceeds from want of Understanding the *Discipline* of the *Church* at that time; for Excommunication did not imply any such *authoritative Act* of throwing men out of the Communion of the *whole Church*, but only a declaring that they would not admit such Persons to communion with themselves. And therefore might be done by Equals to Equals, and sometimes by *Inferiours* to *Superiours*. In Equals, it is apparent by *Johannes Antiochenus* in the *Ephesine Council* excommunicating *Cyril Patriarch* of *Alexandria*; and I suppose you will not acknowledge it may be done by *Inferiours*, if we can produce any Examples of *Popes* being excommunicated; and what say you then to the *African* Bishops excommunicating *Pope Vigilius* as *Victor Tununensis* an *African* Bishop himself relates it: Will you say now that *Victor's* excommunicating the *Asian Churches* argued his Authority over them, when another *Victor* tells us, *That the* African *Bishops solemnly excommunicated the Pope himself?* And I hope you will not deny but the *Bishop of Rochester* might as well excommunicate the *Archbishop of York*, as these *Africans* excommunicate the *Bishop of Rome*. What say you to the expunging the Name of *Felix Bishop of Rome* out of the *Diptychs* of the *Church*, by *Acacius* the *Patriarch of Constantinople?* What say you to *Hilary's Anathema* against *Pope Liberius*? If these *Excommunications* did not argue just Power and Authority over the Persons excommunicated, neither could *Pope Victor's* do it. For it is apparent by the practice of the *Church* that Excommunication argued

Vales. not. in Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

Euseb. ibid. Socr. l. 5. c. 22.

Africani Antistites Vigilium Romanum Episcopum damnatorum trium capitulorum Synodaliter à Catholicâ communione, reservato ei pœnitentiæ loco, recludunt. Victor Tununens. Chronic. p. 10.

no

no such *Superiority* in the Persons who did it; but all the Force of it lay in the Sense of the *Church*; for by whomsoever the Sentence was pronounced, if all other *Churches* observed it, (as most commonly they did while the *Unity* of the *Church* continued) then they were out of the *Communion* of the *Catholick Church*; if not, then it was only the particular Declaration of those Persons or *Churches* who did it. And in this Case the Validity of the *Pope's* Excommunication of the *Asian Bishops* depended upon the *Acceptance* of it by other *Churches*, which not consenting to it, he could not throw them out of the Communion of the *whole Church*, but only declare, that if they came to *Rome*, he would not admit them to Communion with him. And therefore *Ruffinus* well renders that place in *Eusebius* out of *Irenæus* his Epistle to *Victor*, ἐξέπεσε διὰ τὸ ἔξω τοῦτο ἀπεβλήθησαν τινές: By these Words, *Nunquam tamen ob hoc repulsi sunt ab Ecclesiæ societate, aut venientes ab illis partibus non sunt suscepti*, so that ἀποβάλλειν may as well signifie *not to receive* as *to cast out*; for the *Churches* not receiving, is her casting out. Thus, I hope, it is evident that his Lordship hath received no Injury by these *lighter Skirmishes*.

We now follow you into *hotter Service*; For you say, *he ventures at last to grapple with the Authority it self, alledged by* A. C. *out of St.* Irenæus; where, in the first place, you wink and strike; and let your Blows fall besides him, for fear he should return them, or some one for him. You Quarrel with his *Translation of the Authority cited by him:* but that the Ground of this Quarrel may be understood, we must first enquire what his Lordship hath to say for himself. *The Place of* Irenæus *is, To this Church (he speaks of* Rome), propter potentiorem principalitatem, *for the more powerful Principality of it, 'tis necessary that every Church, that is the faithful,* undique *round about, should have recourse. Now for this,* (his Lordship saith) *there was very great Reason in* Irenæus *his time, that upon any Difference arising in the Faith,* Omnes undique Fideles, *all the Faithful, or, if you will, all the Churches round about, should have recourse, that is, resort to* Rome *being the Imperial City, and so a Church of more powerful Principality, than any other at that time in those Parts of the World. But this* (his Lordship saith) *will not exalt* Rome *to be Head of the Church Universal.* Here your Blood rises, and you begin a most furious Encounter with his Lordship for translating *undique round about, as if* (say you) *St.* Irenæus *spake only of those neighbouring Churches round about* Rome, *and not the Churches throughout the World; whereas* undique *as naturally signifies, every where, and, from all Parts: witness* Thomas Thomasius, *where the word* undique *is thus Englished, From all Parts, Places, and Corners, every where.* Can you blame me now if I seek for a Retreat into some *strong hold*, or if you will, some *more powerful Principality*, when I see so dreadful a Charge begun, with *Thomas Thomasius* in the Front? You had routed us once before with *Rider, and other English Lexicons*; but it seems *Rider* had done Service enough that time, now that venerable Person *Thomas Thomasius* must be upon Duty, and do his share for the Catholick Cause. You somewhere complain *how much Catholicks are straitned for want of Books*, Would any one believe you that find you so well stored with *Thomas Thomasius, Rider, and other English Lexicons?* You would sure give us some Cause of Suspicion that there is some *Jesuits School* taught in *England*, and that you are the learned *Master* of it, by your being so conversant in these worthy Authors. But although the Authority of *T. Thomasius* signifie very little with us, yet that of the *Greek Lexicons* might

§. 12. P. 201.

Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, i. e. *eos qui sunt undique fideles: In quâ semper ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.* Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

might do much more if we had the Original *Greek* of *Irenæus* instead of his barbarous Latine Interpreter. For now it is uncertain what Word *Irenæus* used, and so it is but a very uncertain Conjecture which can be drawn from the Signification of πάντοθεν, πανταχόθεν, ἀπαλῆ, unless we knew, which of them was the genuine Word in the *Greek* of *Irenæus*. But you say, *All of them undeniably signifie, from all parts Universally:* and that because they are rendred by the Word *undique*. So that this will make an excellent proof, *undique* must signifie from all Parts, because πάντοθεν, παλαχόθεν, ἀπαλῆ *do signifie so in Greek*; and that these do undeniably signifie so much, appears because they are rendred by *undique*. And I grant they are so; for in the old *Glossary*, which goes under the Name of *Cyril*, *undique* is rendred by παντοχόθεν and *Tully* (than whom we cannot possibly desire a better Author in this case) renders πάντοθεν, by *undique*. For in his Book *de Finibus*, he translates that of *Epicurus* πάντοθεν ἐσταλαγμένοις τῶν ἡδονῶν by *undique complerentur voluptatibus*; and so he renders that Passage in *Plato*'s *Timæus*, παλαχῆ τε ἐκ μέσου ἴσον by *undique æquabilem*, although, as *Hen. Stephanus* notes, that be rather the Signification of παντοχόθεν than παν παχῆ, but still there is some difference between παντοχόθεν, and ἀπαντοχόθεν, and so ἀπαντοχόθεν γῆς in *Greek Authors* notes *ex omni parte terræ*, but παντοχόθεν only *ex quâvis parte*; so that the one signifies *Universally*, the other *Indefinitely: undique* relating properly to the *Circumference*, as *undique æqualis*, *on all sides it is equal*; so that *qui sunt undique fideles*, are, those which lie upon *all Quarters round about*. And so it doth not imply that all Persons were *bound to come*, but that from *all Quarters some did come*; as *Herodian* speaks of *Rome*, πολυανθρώπῳ τε ἔσῃ, καὶ τὰς παντοχόθεν ἐπιδεχομένῃ, *that it was very populous, and did receive them which came from all Parts*; which doth very fitly explain the Sense of *Irenæus*, that to *Rome* being the *Imperial City*, Men came from *all Quarters*. But the Sense of this will be more fully understood by a parallel Expression in the *Ninth Canon* of the *Council of Antioch*, in which it is decreed, that the *Metropolitan* should have the Care of all the *Bishops* in his *Province*, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει παντοχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς τὰ πράγματα ἔχοντας, *because all Persons who have Business from all Parts, resort to the Metropolis:* here παλαχόθεν συντρέχειν, is the very same with the *undiq; convenire*, in *Irenæus*; so that it relates not to any *Obligation* on *Churches to resort thither*, but that being the *Seat* of the *Empire*, all Believers from all Parts did make their Recourse thither. Which is most fully expressed by *Leo*, speaking of *S. Peter*'s coming to *Rome*, *Cujus nationis homines in hâc Urbe non essent? aut quæ uspiam gentes ignorarent, quod Roma didicisset?* And so, if I grant you that it extends *to all Parts*, I know not what Advantages you will get by it; for *Irenæus* his Design is, to shew that there was no such secret Tradition left by the *Apostles*, as the *Valentinians* pretended. And for this he appeals to the *Church* of *Rome*, which being seated in the *Imperial City*, to which Believers from all Parts did resort, it is impossible to conceive that the *Apostles* should have left such a Tradition, and it not to be heard of there: which is the plain, genuine meaning of *Irenæus* his Words. Not as you weakly imagine, *That all Churches in all Doubts of Faith, were bound to have their Recourse thither, as to their constant guide therein.* For *Irenæus* was not disputing, What was to be done by Christians in Doubts of Faith; but was enquiring into a matter of Fact, *viz.* Whether any such *Tradition* were ever left in the *Church*, or no; and therefore nothing could be more pertinent or convincing, than appealing to that *Church* to which *Christians* resorted from all Parts; for it could not be conceived, but, if the *Apostles* had left such a *Tradition*

De Finib. l. 2. v. Hen. Steph. Lexicon Ciceron. p. 55.

Herod. Hist. l. 1. p. 18.

Concil. Antioch. Can. 9.

Leo. Sermon. de S. Petro & Paulo.

P. 202.

tion any where, it would be heard of at *Rome*. And you most notoriously pervert the meaning of *Irenæus*, when you would make the Force of his Argument to lie *in the Necessity of all Christians resorting to* Rome, *because the Doctrine or Tradition of the Roman Church was, as it were, the Touchstone of all Apostolical Doctrine*. But, I suppose, you deal in some *English Logicians*, as well as *English Lexicons*, and therefore I must submit both to your *Grammar* and *Logick*; But your Ingenuity is as great as your Reason; for you first pervert his Lordships meaning, and then make him dispute ridiculously, that you might come out with your triumphant Language, *Is not this fine Meandrick Logick, well beseeming so noble a Labyrinth?* Whereas his Lordship's reasoning is so plain and clear, that none but such a one as had a *Labyrinth* in his Brains, could have imagined any *Meanders* in it? As appears by what I have said already, in the Explication of the Meaning of *Irenæus*.

But that I may see the strength of your *Logick* out of this Place of *Irenæus*, I will translate *undiq*; and *semper*, *as fully* as you would have me, and give you the Words at large, *in which, by those who come from all Places, the Apostolical Tradition is always conserved.* What is it you infer hence? *From the Premises you argue thus: All the faithful every where, must of necessity have recourse to the Church of* Rome, *by reason of her more powerful Principality. This is S.* Irenæus *his Proposition. But there could be no Necessity they a'l should have Recourse to that Church, by reason of her more powerful Principality, if her said Power extended not to them all. This is evident to Reason.* Ergo, *this more powerful Principality of the Roman Church, must needs extend to all the faithful every where, and not only to those of the Suburbicary Churches, or Patriarchal Dioceses of* Rome, *as the Bishop pleads.* Now I see, you are a man at Arms, and know, not only how to *grapple* with his Lordship, but with *Irenæus* to boot. But we must first see, How *Irenæus* himself argues, that we may the better understand the Force of what you deduce from him. The Question, as I have told you already, was, Whether the *Apostles* left any such Tradition in the *Church*, as the *Valentinians* pretended: *Irenæus* proves they did not, because, if there had been any such, the Apostolical Churches would certainly have preserved the Memory of it; but because it would be too tedious to insist on the Succession of all *Churches*, he therefore makes choice of the most famous, the *Church* of *Rome*, in which the *Apostolical Tradition* had been derived by a Succession of *Bishops* down to his own time; *and by this* (saith he) *we confound all those who through vain glory, or blindness, do gather any such thing. For* (saith he) *to this Church for the more powerful Principality all Churches do make resort*, i. e. *the Believers from all Parts, in which by those who come from all Parts the Apostolical Tradition is always preserved.* We must now see, How *Irenæus* argues according to your Sense of his Words. If all the faithful every where, must of Necessity have Recourse to the *Church* of *Rome*, for *her more powerful Principality*; then there is no secret Tradition left by the *Apostles*. But, Where lies the Connexion between these two? What had the *Valentinians* to do with the Power of the *Church* of *Rome* over other *Churches*? That was not the Business they disputed; their Question was, Whether there were no such *Tradition* as they pretended? And *Rome* might have never so great Power over all *Churches*, and yet have this secret *Tradition* too. For now we see, when she pretends to the greatest Power, nay, to *Infallibility*, she pretends the highest to *Traditions*. Where then lies the force of *Irenæus* his Argument? Was it in this, that the *Valentinians* did acknowledge the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome* then, in Traditions? This were indeed to the

§. 13. P. 203.

Purpoſe, if it could be proved; Or, Doth *Irenæus* go about to prove this firſt? But by what Argument doth he prove it ſo, that the *Valentinians* might be convinced by it? *Yes*, ſay you, *he ſaith, That all the Faithful muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to the Church of* Rome? This is your way of proving indeed, to take Things for granted; but, How doth this *Neceſſity* appear? Becauſe, ſay you, *She hath the more powerful Principality:* But, What *Principality* do you mean? Over all *Churches*? But that was the thing in *Queſtion*. So that if you will make *Irenæus* ſpeak Senſe, and argue pertinently, his Meaning can be no other than this. If there be ſuch a *Tradition* left, it muſt be left ſomewhere among *Chriſtians*: If it be left among them, it may be known by Enquiry, Whether they own any ſuch or no. But becauſe it would be troubleſome ſearching of all *Churches*, we may know their Judgment more compendiouſly; there is the *Church* of *Rome* near us, a famous and ancient *Church*, ſeated in the chief *City* of the *Empire*, to which all Perſons have *Neceſſities* to go; and among them, you cannot but ſuppoſe, but that out of every *Church* ſome faithful Perſons ſhould come, and therefore it is very unreaſonable to think, that the *Apoſtolical Tradition* hath not always been preſerved there, when Perſons come from all Places thither. Is not every Thing in this Account of *Irenæus* his Words very clear and pertinent to his preſent Diſpute? But in the Senſe you give of them they are little to the Purpoſe, and very Precarious and inconſequent. And therefore ſince *the more powerful Principality* is not that of the *Church*, but of the *City*; ſince the neceſſity of *Recourſe* thither, is not *for Doubts of Faith*, but other Occaſions: Therefore it by no Means follows thence, *That this Church's Power did extend over the Faithful every where*; thus by explaining your Propoſition, your Concluſion is aſhamed of it ſelf, and runs away. For your Argument comes to this; If Engliſh men from all Parts be forced to reſort to *London*, then *London* hath the Power over all *England*; or if one ſhould ſay, if ſome from all *Churches* in *England* muſt reſort to *London*, then the *Church* at *London* hath Power over all the *Churches* in *England*; and if this Conſequence be good, yours is: For it is of the ſame Nature of it; the Neceſſity of the *Reſort*, not lying in the *Authority* of the *Church*, but in the *Dignity* of the City, the Words in all probability in the Greek, being διὰ τὴν βασιλέυσαν ἀρχὴν, and ſo relate to the *Dignity* of *Rome*, as the *Imperial City*.

§. 14. From whence we proceed to the Vindication of *Ruffinus*, in his Tranſlation of the 6th *Canon* of the *Council* of *Nice*. The Occaſion of which is this.

P. 183. His Lordſhip ſaith, *Suppoſing that the powerful Principality be aſcribed to the Church of* Rome, *yet it follows not that it ſhould have Power over all Churches; for this Power was confined within its own Patriarchate and Juriſdiction, and that* (ſaith he) *was very large, containing all the Provinces in the Dioceſe of* Italy *(in the old Senſe of the Word Dioceſe) which Provinces the Lawyers and others term Suburbicaries. There were ten of them; the three Iſlands*, Sicily, Corſica *and* Sardinia, *and the other ſeven upon the firm Land of* Italy. *And this, I take it, is plain in* Ruffinus. *For he living ſhortly after the* Nicene Council, *as he did, and being of* Italy, *as he was, he might very well know the bounds of the Patriarch's Juriſdiction, as it was then practiſed. And he ſays expreſly, that according to the old Cuſtom, the Roman Patriarch's Charge was confined within the Limits of the Suburbican Churches. To avoid the Force of this Teſtimony, Cardinal* Perron *lays load upon* Ruffinus. *For he charges him with Paſſion, Ignorance, and Raſhneſs. And one piece of his Ignorance is, that he hath ill tranſlated the Canon of the Council of* Nice. *Now, although*

Apud Alexandriam ut in Urbe Româ, vetuſta conſuetudo ſervetur, ut ille Ægypti ut hic Suburbicariarum Eccleſiarum ſolititudinem gerat. Ruffin. Eccleſ. hiſt. l. 1. c. 6.

although his Lordship doth not approve of it as a Translation; yet he saith, Ruffinus *living in that Time and Place, was very like well to know and understand the Limits and Bounds of that Patriarchate of* Rome, *in which he lived. This* (you say) *is very little to his Lordship's Advantage, since it is inconsistent with the Vote of all Antiquity, and gives S.* Irenæus *the Lye;* but if the former be no truer than the latter, it may be very much to his Advantage, notwithstanding what you have produced to the contrary. What the ground is, Why the *Roman Patriarchate* was confined within the *Roman Diocese*, I have already shewed in the precedent Chapter, in Explication of the *Nicene Canon*. We must now therefore examine the Reasons you bring, Why the Notion of the *Suburbicary Churches* must be extended beyond the Limits his Lordship assigns; that *of the smallness of Jurisdiction compared with other Patriarchs*, I have given an account of already, *viz.* from the Correspondency of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Government; for the Civil *Dioceses* of the *Eastern* part of the *Empire* did extend much farther than the *Western* did; and that was the Reason, Why the *Patriarchs* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, had a larger *Metropolitical* Jurisdiction than the *Bishop* of *Rome* had. But you tell us, *That Suburbicary Churches must be taken as generally all Churches and Cities any ways subordinate to the City of* Rome; *which was all at that time known by the Name of* Urbs, *or City,* κατ' ἐξοχήν, *by way of Excellency; not as it related to the Præfect or Governour of* Rome, *in regard of whose ordinary Jurisdiction, we confess it commanded only those few Places about it in* Italy; *but as it related to the Emperor himself; in which Sense the Word Suburbicary, rightly signifies all Cities or Churches whatsoever within the Roman Empire; as the Word* Romania *also anciently signified the whole Imperial Territory, as Card.* Perron *clearly proves upon this Subject.* But, this is one Instance of what Mens Wits will do, when they are resolved to break through any thing: For, whoever that had read of the *Suburbicary Regions and Provinces* in the *Code* of *Theodosius*, or other Parts of the *Civil Law*, as distinguished from other *Provinces* under the *Roman Empire*, and those in *Italy* too, could ever have imagined that the Notion of *Suburbicary Churches* had been any other than what was correspondent to those *Regions* and *Provinces*? But let that be granted which *Sirmondus* so much contends for, that the Notion of *Suburbicary* may have different Respects, and so sometimes be taken for the *Churches* within the *Roman Diocese*, sometimes for those within the *Roman Patriarchate*, and sometimes for those, which are under the Pope as *Universal Pastor*; yet, How doth it appear that ever *Ruffinus* took it in any other than the first Sense? No other *Provinces* being called *Suburbicary*, but such as were under the Jurisdiction either of the *Roman Præfect* within a *hundred Miles* of the City (within which compass, References and Appeals were made to him) or at the most, to the *Lieutenant* of the *Roman Diocese*, whose Jurisdiction extended to those *ten Provinces* which his Lordship mentions. It is not therefore, in what Sense Words may be taken, but in what Sense they were taken, and what Evidence there is that ever they were so understood. Never was any Controversie more ridiculous, than that concerning the extent of the *Suburbicary Regions or Provinces*, if *Suburbicary* were taken in your Sense for all the *Cities* within *the Roman Empire*. But this Extending to the *Suburbicary Churches*, as far as the *Roman Empire*, is like the Art of those *Jesuits*, who in their setting forth *Anastasius de vitis Pontificum*, in *Stephanus* 5. turn'd *Papa Urbis* into *Papa Orbis*; for that being so mean and contemptible a Title, they thought much it should remain as it did; but *Papa Orbis* was magnificent and glorious. I wonder therefore, that instead of extending

P. 203. n. 7.

Cod. Theodos. l. 11. tit. 1. c. 9. tit 16. c. 12. tit. 28. 12.

Adventor. p 2. de Eccles. subvic. c. 1.

the Signification of *Suburbicary Churches*, you do not rather pretend that it ought to be read *Suborbicary*, and ſo to ſuit exactly with the *Papa Orbis*, as importing all thoſe *Churches* which are under the Power of the *Univerſal Paſtour*. For, Why ſhould you ſtop at the Confines of the *Roman Empire*? How comes his Juriſdiction to be confined within that? By what right did he govern the *Churches* within the *Empire*, and not thoſe without? Surely not, as *Primate*, *Metropolitan*, or *Patriarch* of the *Roman Empire*, for thoſe are Titles yet unheard of in *Antiquity*; if as *Head of the Church*, How comes the *Juriſdiction* of that to be at all limited? Were there no *Churches* without the *Empire* then? I hope you will not deny that; If there were, To whom did the *Juriſdiction* over them belong? To the *Pope*, or not? If not, How comes he to be *Head of the Church*, *and Univerſal Paſtour*? If they did, Why were not theſe *Suburbicary Churches*, as well as thoſe within the *Empire*? Beſides, it is confeſſed by the learnedeſt among you, that when the notion of *Suburbicary* is extended beyond the *Suburbicary Provinces*, it is not out of any relation to the City, but to the Power of the *Biſhop* of the *City*, and therefore the *Suburbicary Churches* may be larger than the *Suburbicary Provinces*. But if this be true (as it is the only probable Evaſion) then it is impoſſible for you, to confine the *Suburbicary Churches* within the *Roman Empire*, without confining the *Juriſdiction* of the *Roman Biſhop* within thoſe *Bounds* too. For if the inlarging the Notion of *Suburbicary Churches* depends upon the Extent of his Power, the fixing the *Limits* of thoſe *Churches*, determines the Bounds of his Power too. Which is utterly deſtructive to your Pretences of the *Pope's being Head of the Univerſal Church*, and not barely of the *Churches* within the *Roman Empire*. But if it had been *Ruffinus* his Deſign to expreſs by *Suburbicary Churches*, all thoſe within the *Roman Empire*, ſurely he made choice of the moſt unhappy Expreſſion to do it by, which he could well have thought of. For, it being then ſo well known what the *Suburbicary Provinces* were, that in the *Code* of *Theodoſius*, where they are ſo often mentioned, they are not diſtinctly enumerated, becauſe they were then as well underſtood as the *African*, *Gallican*, or *Britannick Provinces*; How abſurd were it for him, to take a Word in common uſe, and ſo well known, and apply it to ſuch a Senſe, as no Example beſides can be produced for it? For if any one at that time ſhould have ſpoken of the *African*, *Gallican*, or *Britannick Churches*, no one would have imagined any other than thoſe which were contained in the ſeveral Provinces under thoſe Names. What Reaſon is there then, that any thing elſe ſhould be apprehended by the *Suburbicary Churches*? I know the laſt Refuge of moſt of your ſide, inſtead of explaining theſe *Suburbicary Churches*, hath been to rail at *Ruffinus*, and call him *Dunce* and *Blockhead*, and Enemy to the *Roman Church* (Inſtances were eaſie to be given, if it were at all neceſſary) but beſides that, it were eaſie to make it appear, that *Ruffinus* was no ſuch Fool, as ſome have taken him for: (And if they think ſo, becauſe S. *Hierom* gives him ſuch hard Words, they muſt think ſo of all whom S. *Hierom* oppoſed) he is ſufficiently vindicated in this Tranſlation by the *Antient Vatican Copy* of the *Nicene Canons*, out of which this very *Canon* is produced by *Sirmondus*, and the very ſame Word of *Suburbicary* therein uſed, And that in ſuch a Manner, as utterly deſtroys your Senſe of the *Suburbicary Churches*, for ſuch as are within the *Roman Empire*; for that Copy calls them, *Loca Suburbicaria*, and, Will you ſay, thoſe are the *Provinces* within the *Roman Empire* too? Can any one

De primatu Eccleſiæ Romanæ & aliarum civitatum Epiſcopis. Antiqui moris eſt, ut Epiſcopus Urbis Romæ habeat Principatum; Ut Suburbicaria loca, & omnem Provinciam ſuam ſollicitudine gubernet. Codex Vaticanus apud Sirmond. de Regi. & Eccleſ. Suburb.

one rationally think that any other Places should be called *Suburbicary*, but such as lie *about the City*? And by the same Interpretation which you here use, you may call all *England* the *Suburbs* of *London*; because *London is the City*, κατ' ἐξοχήν, as you speak; and therefore all the *Churches* of *England* must be *Suburbicary* to *London*. But if you think this incongruous, you may on the same Account judge the other to be so too: It appears then, that the *Suburbicary Places* in the *Vatican Copy* (and in that very *Antient Copy* which *Justellus* had, which agrees with the *Vatican*) are the same with the *Suburbicary Churches* in *Ruffinus*; and, if you will explain these latter of the *Roman Empire*, you must do the former too. But not only the *Vatican Copy*, but all other different *Versions* of the *Nicene Canon* utterly overthrow this *Opinion* of *Cardinal Perron*, that the *Suburbicary Churches* must be taken for those within the *Roman Empire*. For in the *Arabick* Version published by *Turrianus*, it is thus rendred, *Siquidem similiter Episcopus Romæ, i. e. successor Petri Apostoli, potestatem habet omnium civitatum, & locorum quæ sunt circa eam.* Are all the Cities and Places in the *Roman Empire*, *circa eam*, about the *City of* Rome? If not, neither can the *Churches* be. And in that *Arabick* Paraphrase, which *Salmasius* had of the famous *Peireskius*, it is translated much more agreeably to the *Nicene Canon* in these Words; *Propterea quod Episcopus Romanus etiam hunc morem obtinet, & hoc ei adjunctum est, ut potestatem habeat supra civitates, & loca quæ prope eam sunt.* Which is yet more full, to shew the Absurdity of your Exposition, for these *Suburbicary Churches* must be then in Places near the City of *Rome*. And agreeably to these, *Aristinus*, the *Greek* Collector of the Canons hath it, καὶ ὁ Ῥώμης τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥώμην, which *Ruffinus* his *Suburbicary* doth exactly render. By whom now, must we be judged, what is meant by these *Suburbicary Churches*? By you who make a forced and strained Interpretation of the Word *Suburbicary* to such a Sense, of which there is no Evidence in *Antiquity*, or Reason, and is withal manifestly repugnant to the Design of the *Canon*, which is to proportion the *Dioceses* of the *Bishops* of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, by the Example of *Rome* (which had been very absurd if these *Suburbicary Churches* did comprehend the *Dioceses* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and all other *Provinces*, as you make them)? Or else must we be judged by the ancient *Versions* of the *Nicene Canon*, *Latin* and *Arabick*, and by other *Greek Paraphrases*, all which unanimously concurr to overthrow that *Figment*, that the *Suburbicary Churches are all those within the Roman Empire*. And this the learned *Petrus de Marcâ* was so sensible of that he saith, *Ruffinus* did *rectissimè & ex usu recepto*, very agreeably both to Reason and Custom, compare the *Alexandrian* and *Roman Bishop* in this, that he should have the Power over the *Diocese* of *Egypt*, by the same right that the *Bishop* of *Rome* had over the *Urbicary Diocese*; or, saith he, *ut Ruffinus elegantissimè loquitur, In Ecclesiis Suburbicariis, id est, in iis Ecclesiis quæ decem Provinciis Suburbicariis continebantur*; *as* Ruffinus *most elegantly speaks* (sure then he thought him no such ignorant Person, as *Perron* and others from him have reproached him to be) *In the Suburbicary Churches*, that is, *in those Churches which are contained in the ten Suburbicary Provinces. For*, as he goes on, *the calling of Synods, the Ordination of Bishops, the full Administratinn of the Churches in those Provinces, did belong to the Bishop of* Rome; *as to the Bishop of* Alexandria *in the Ægyptian Diocese, and to the Bishop of* Antioch *in the Oriental.* Which he likewise confirms by the ancient *Latin Interpreter* of the *Nicene Canons*, who, he saith, was elder than *Dionysius Exiguus*; in whose Interpretation, he makes the *Suburbicaria loca* to contain the *four Regions about*

De Concordia Sacerdot. & Imp. l. 1. c. 7. sect. 6.

about Rome, which made the proper Metropolitan Province of the *Roman Bishop*, comprehending sixty nine *Bishopricks*; and that which he calls his *Province*, to be the *Urbicary Diocese*, contained in those *ten Provinces* which his Lordship mentions.

§. 15. But the Pope's being *Universal Bishop* having so little Evidence elsewhere, his Lordship's Adversary at last hath Recourse to this, *That the Bishop of*
P. 185. n. 14 Rome *is S.* Peter's *Successor, and therefore to him we must have Recourse.* To which his Lordship answers; *The Fathers I deny not, ascribe very much to S.* Peter; *but 'tis to S.* Peter *in his own Person. And among them* Epiphanius *is as free and as frequent in extolling S.* Peter, *as any of them: And yet did he never intend to give an absolute Principality to* Rome *in S.* Peter's *Right*; *which he at large manifests, by a Place particularly insisted on, in which he proves, that the building of the Church on S.* Peter *in* Epiphanius *his Sense, is not as if he and his Successors were to be Monarchs over it for ever: but it is the edifying and establishing the Church in the true Faith of Christ, by the Confession which S.* Peter *made. And so,* saith he, *he expresses himself elsewhere most plainly, that Christ's building his Church upon this Rock, was upon the Confession of S.* Peter, *and the solid Faith contained therein. And that* Epiphanius *could not mean that S.* Peter *was any Rock or Foundation of the Church, so as that he and his Successors must be relied on in all Matters of Faith, and govern the Church like Princes and Monarchs,* he proves *not only by the Context, but because he makes S.* James *to succeed our Lord in the Principality of the Church. And* Epiphanius, saith he, *was too full of Learning and Industry, to speak contrary to himself in a Point of this Moment.* This is the sum of his Lordship's Discourse: To which you answer, *That it is clear even by the Texts of* Epiphanius, *that this Promise by Christ to S.* Peter, *is derived to his Successors*; which you prove *from hence, because he saith, That by the*
P. 204. n. 9. *Gates of Hell, Heresies and Hereticks are understood: now this, say you, cannot be understood of S.* Peter's *Person alone*; *for then, Why not Heresies and Hereticks prevail against the Church after S.* Peter's *Death*; *yea so far as utterly to extinguish the true Faith?* But, Cannot *God* preserve the *Church* from being extinguished by *Heresies*, though S. *Peter* hath no *Infallible Successor?* Is not the Promise, That the *Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church!* It doth not say, That the *Gates of Hell* shall not prevail against any that shall pretend to be his *Successors at* Rome: For if *Heresies* be those *Gates*, they have too often prevailed against them. And, Is this your way indeed to secure the *Church*, by providing S. *Peter* such Successors, which may be *Hereticks* themselves? But much more wisely did S. *Gregory* say, If one pretends to be *Universal Bishop*, then upon his falling, the *Church* must fall too; much more wisely the *Council* of *Basil* in their Synodal Epistle, object this as the necessary consequent of the Doctrine of the Pope's *Supremacy*, that, *errante Pontifice, quod sæpe contigit & contingere potest, tota erraret Ecclesia*; that, in case the Pope *err*, which often hath happened, and often may, the whole *Church* must err too. And yet this is your way to secure the *Church* from Errors and Heresies. If you designed to ruine it, you could not do it in a more compendious way, than to oblige the whole *Church* to believe the dictates of one, who is so far from that *Infallibility* which St. *Peter* had, that he follows him in nothing more than his *Falls*: I wish he would in his *Repentance* too, and that would be the best way to secure the *Church* from *Errors* and *Heresies*. Which she can never be secured from, as long as one pretends to be her *Head*, who may not only err himself, but propound that to be believed *infallibly*, which is notoriously false. For that Popes as Popes may err, and propound false

Doctrine

Doctrine to the Church, not only *Protestants*, but some of your own Communion have abundantly proved; particularly *Sim. Vigorius* in his Defence of *Richerius* in his Commentary on the forecited *Synodal Epistle of the Council of* Basil. And calls that Opinion, That the Pope may err as a private Doctor, but not as Pope, *ineptissimam opinionem, a most foolish Opinion.* For otherwise, as he saith, it would be most absurd to say, *That the Pope might be deposed for Heresie*; for he is not deposed as a private *Doctor*, but as Pope. And this he proves by the contradictious Decrees of *Adrian* 3. to *Adrian* 1. and *Leo* 7. and so of *Formosus*, *Martinus*, *Romanus*, to *Johannes*, *Stephanus*, and *Sergius*; Nay, he instanceth in that famous Decree of *Boniface* 8. in pronouncing so definitively, that it was *De necessitate salutis, subesse Romano-Pontifici* (necessary to Salvation to be subject to the Pope) and that he decreed this as Pope, appears by those Words, *Declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus, omnino esse de necessitate salutis*; than which Words, nothing can be more express and definitive, and yet Pope *Innocent* 3. asserts, that the *King of* France hath *no Superiour upon Earth.* Is not the *Church* like then to be well secured from *Heresies*, when her *Infallible Heads* may so apparently contradict each other, and this acknowledged by Men of your own Communion? Nothing then can be more absurd or unreasonable, than to say, That the *Church* cannot be preserved from being extinguished by *Heresie*, unless the Pope be S. *Peter's Successor*, as *Head of the Church.* To his Lordship's Testimonies out of *Epiphanius*, that S. *James succeeded our Lord in the Principality of the Church*, you answer, 1. *That in the Places he alledges, there's not a Word of the Churches Principality.* 2. *That he only implies that he was the first of the Apostles made Bishop of any particular Place*, viz. *at* Hierusalem, *which is called Christ's Throne, as any Episcopal Chair is in ancient Ecclesiastical Writers.* But, whosoever will examine the Places in *Epiphanius*, will find much more intended by him, than what you will allow: For not only he saith, that he first had an *Episopal Chair*; but that our Lord committed to him τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *his Throne upon Earth*, which surely is much more than can be said of any meer *Episcopal Chair*; and I believe you will be much to seek where *Hierusalem* was ever called *Christ's Throne upon Earth* after his Ascension to *Heaven.* Besides, if it were, it is the strongest Prejudice that may be against the *Principality* of the *Roman See*, if *Jerusalem* was made by *Christ's Throne* here. And, that a *Principality* over the whole *Church* is intended by *Epiphanius*, seems more clear by that other Place which his Lordship cites, wherein he not only saith, *That* James *was first made Bishop*, but gives this Reason for it, *because he was the Brother of our Lord*; and if you observe, How *Epiphanius* brings it in, you will say, he intended more by it, than to make him the *first Bishop.* For he was disputing before, How the *Kingdom* and the *Priesthood* did both belong to Christ, and that Christ had transfused both into his *Church*, ἵδρυται ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *but his Throne is established for ever in his holy Church*; consisting both of his Kingdom and Priesthood, both which he communicated to his Church: *quare Jacobus primus omnium est Episcopus constitutus*, as *Petavius* renders it, so that he seems to settle *James* in that *Principality* of the *Church*, which he had given to it; and what Reason can you have to think, but that *Christ's Throne*, in which *Epiphanius* saith, *James* was settled, in the other Place, is the same with his *Throne* in the *Church* which he mentions here? And, What would you give for so clear a Testimony in Antiquity for *Christ's settling S.* Peter in his *Throne* at *Rome*, as here is for his placing S. *James* in it at *Jerusalem*?

Vigorius Com. in ep. Synod. Concil. Basil. c. 7. p. 63.

P. 205.

Epiph. hæres. 76. p. 1039.

Hæres. 29. p. 119.

His

§. 16. P. 187 n. 15. His Lordship goes on. *And he still tells us, the Bishop of* Rome *is S.* Peter's *Successor. Well, suppose that, What then? What? Why then, he succeeded in all S.* Peter's *Prerogatives which are ordinary, and belonged to him as a Bishop, though not in the extraordinary, which belonged to him as an Apostle. For that is it which you all say, but no Man proves.* Yes, you say, *Bellarmine hath done it in his Disputations on that Subject.* For this you produce a Saying of his, *That when the Apostles were dead, the Apostolical Authority remained alone in S.* Peter's *Successor.* I see with you still, *saying* and *proving* are all one. But since you referr the Reader to *Bellarmine* for Proofs, I shall likewise refer him to the many sufficient Answers which have been given him.

P. 206. You argue stoutly afterwards, *That because Primacy in the modern Sense of it implies Supremacy, therefore wherever the Fathers attribute a Primacy to* Peter *among the Apostles, they mean his Authority and Power over them.* I see, you are resolved to believe that there cannot be one, two, and three; but the *first* must be *Head* over all the rest. A *Primacy of Order*, his Lordship truly saith, *was never denied him by Protestants; and an universal Supremacy of Power was never granted him by the Primitive Christians.* Prove but in the first place that S. *Peter* had such a *Supremacy* of Power over the Apostles, and all *Christian Churches*, and that this Power is conveyed to the Pope, you will do something. In the mean time we acknowledge as much *Primacy, Authority, and Principality in S.* Peter, as D. *Reynolds* proves in the place you cite, none of which come near that *Supremacy of Power* which you contend for, and we must deny till we see it better proved than it is by you. But you offer it from S. *Hierom*, because he saith, *The Primacy was given to* Peter *for preventing Schism, but a meer precedency of Order is not sufficient for that.* But, Doth not S. *Hierome* in the Words immediately before, say, *That the Church is equally built on all the Apostles, and that they all receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that the firmness of the Church is equally grounded on them;* and, Can he possibly then mean in the following Words any other *Primacy*, but such as is among *Equals*, and not any *Supremacy of Power* over them? And certainly you think the *Apostles* very *unruly*, who would not be kept in Order by such a *Primacy* as this is, unless S. *Peter* had full *Jurisdiction* over them. And since it is so evident, that S. *Hierom* can mean no other but such a *Preheminence* as this for preventing *Schism*, you had need have a good art, that can deduce from thence *a necessity of a Supremacy of Power in the Church for that end.* For, say you, *Whatsoever Power or Jurisdiction was necessary in the Apostle's time for preventing Schisms, must*, à fortiori, *be necessary in all succeeding Ages;* but still be sure to hold to that Power or Jurisdiction which was in the *Apostles* times, and we grant you all you can prove from it. You still dispute gallantly, when you beg the Question, and argue as formally as I have met with one, when you have supposed that which it most concerned you to prove; Which is, that *God* hath appointed a *Supremacy of Power* in one particular *Person*, always to continue in the *Church* for Preservation of Faith and Unity in it. For, if you suppose the *Church* cannot be governed, or *Schism* prevented without this, you may well save your self a Labour of proving any further. But, so far are we from seeing such a *Supremacy of Power* as you challenge to the Pope to be necessary for preventing *Schisms*, that we are sufficiently convinced that the *Usurping* of it hath caused one of the *greatest* ever was in the *Christian World.*

Reynolds against *Hart. c. 5. div. 3.*

Hieron. l. 1. Jovin. c. 14.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Pope's Authority, not proved from Scripture, or Reaſon.

The Inſufficiency of the Proofs from Scripture acknowledged by Romaniſts themſelves. The Impertinency of Luk. 22. 32. *to that Purpoſe. No Proofs offered for it but the ſuſpected Teſtimonies of Popes in their own Cauſe. That no Infallibility can thence come to the Pope as St.* Peter's *Succeſſor confeſſed and proved by* Vigorius *and Mr.* White. *The Weakneſs of the Evaſion of the Pope's erring as a private Doctor, but not as Pope acknowledged by them.* John 21. 15. *proves nothing towards the Pope's Supremacy. How far the Pope's Authority is owned by the Romaniſts over Kings.* T. C's *beggings of the Queſtion, and tedious Repetitions, paſt over. The Argument from the Neceſſity of a living Judge, conſidered. The Government of the Church not Monarchical, but Ariſtocratical. The Inconveniences of Monarchical Government in the Church manifeſted from Reaſon. No Evidence that Chriſt intended to inſtitute ſuch Government in his Church, but much againſt it. The Communicatory Letters in the Primitive Church argued an Ariſtocracy.* Gerſon's *Teſtimony from his Book* de Auferribilitate Papæ, *explained and vindicated.* St. Hierome's *Teſtimony full againſt a Monarchy in the Church. The Inconſiſtency of the Pope's Monarchy with that of Temporal Princes. The Supremacy of Princes in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, aſſerted by the Scripture and Antiquity, as well as the Church of* England.

WE are now come to the Places of *Scripture* inſiſted on for the Proof of the *Pope's* Authority; which you have been ſo often and ſucceſsfully beaten out of, by ſo many powerful Aſſaults of our Writers, that it is Matter of Admiration that you ſhould yet think to find any Shelter there. For thoſe which you yet account *Fortreſſes* and *Bulwarks* for your Cauſe, have not only been triumphed over by your Adverſaries, but have been *ſlighted* by the wiſeſt of your Party, and deſerted as moſt untenible Places, as I ſhall make it appear to you in the Progreſs of this Diſpute: In which I ſhall not barely ſhew the palpable Weakneſs of your pretended Proofs, but bring unanſwerable Arguments againſt them from Perſons of your own Communion. For the Force of that Reaſon by which the *Proteſtants* have prevailed over you in this Diſpute hath been ſo great, that it hath brought over ſome of the learneſt of your Party, not only to an Acknowledgment of the Inſufficiency of theſe Proofs, but to a zealous Oppoſition againſt that very Doctrine which you attempt to prove by them. But ſuch is the Fate of a ſinking Cauſe, that it catcheth hold of any thing to ſave it ſelf, though it be the *Anchor* of the Ship which makes it ſink the ſooner. Thus it will appear to be in theſe *baffled* Proofs, which you only bring into the Field to ſhew what Streights you are in for help; and no ſooner appear there, but they fall off to the conquering ſide, and help only to promote your Ruine. But ſince they are in the Place where Arguments ſhould be, we muſt in Civility conſider them, as if they were ſo. The firſt Place then is, *Luke* 22. 32. *I have pray'd for thee that thy faith fail not.* What would a *Philoſopher* think, were he choſen as *Umpire* between us, (as once one was between *Origen* and his Adverſaries) to hear this Place produced to prove the *Pope's Authority* and *Infallibility*? And when a Reaſon is demanded of ſo ſtrange an Inference (from a Promiſe of *Recovery* to St. *Peter*, to an *impoſſibility* of *falling* in the *Pope*) nothing elſe produced, but the

§. 1.

forged *Epiſtles* of ſome *Popes*, and the partial Teſtimonies of others in their own Cauſe? Could he think otherwiſe, but that theſe men loved their Cauſe dearly, and would fain prove it, if they could tell how: But ſince there was neither Evidence in Reaſon or more indifferent Writers in it, yet to let them ſee how confident they were of the *Pope's Infallibility*, they would produce their *Infallible* Teſtimonies, to prove they were *Infallible*. For we ask, What Evidence is there that the Privilege obtained for St. *Peter*, whatever it is, muſt deſcend to his *Succeſſors*; if to his Succeſſors, whether to *all* his Succeſſors, or only to ſome; if only to *ſome*, why to thoſe at *Rome* more than at *Antioch* or any other Place; if to them at *Rome*, why it muſt be underſtood of a *Doctrinal* and not a *ſaving Faith*, as it was in St. *Peter*; if of *Doctrinal*, why not *Abſolutely*, but only *Conditionally*, if they teach the Church? For all theſe and ſeveral other Enquiries of this Nature, we are told, It muſt be ſo underſtood; but if you ask Why, all the Anſwer we can get is, *Becauſe ſeven Popes at one time or other ſaid ſo.*

Q. 2. P. 208. But at this you grow very angry; and tell us, 1. *That* Bellarmine, *beſides theſe, gives ſeveral pregnant Reaſons from the Text it ſelf.* What were it worth, to have a ſight of them! If you had thought them ſo pregnant, you are not ſo ſparing of taking out of *Bellarmine*, but you would have given them us over again. *Bellarmine*'s excellent Proofs are two or three *ſine Dubio's*. *Sine dubio*, ſaith he, *hîc Dominus ſpeciale aliquid Petro impetravit.* And who denies it? But we grant, it was ſo ſpecial to him, that it never came to his Succeſſors; and again, *ſine dubio, ipſis præcipuè debeat eſſe nota ſuæ ſedis auctoritas*, ſpeaking of the *Pope's Teſtimonies* for themſelves, Without all doubt they knew beſt their own Authority. They were wonderfully to blame elſe; but all the Difficulty is, to perſwade others to believe them *ſine dubio*, when they ſpeak in their own Cauſe. And for that I can find no pregnant Reaſon in him at all. Well, but we have a third *ſine dubio* yet, which may be more to the Purpoſe than either of the other two. For *Bellarmine* diſtinguiſhes of two Privileges which Chriſt obtained for St. *Peter*, the firſt is, *That himſelf ſhould never loſe the true Faith though he were tempted of the Devil*; and this his Lordſhip grants, that it was the ſpecial Grace which Chriſt's Prayer obtained, that, notwithſtanding Satan's ſifting him, and his threefold Denyal of his Maſter, he ſhould not fall into a final Apoſtaſie: The ſecond Privilege is, *That he, as Biſhop, ſhould not be able to teach any thing againſt the Faith*, ſive, ut in ſede ejus nunquam inveniretur qui doceret contra veram fidem, *or, that there ſhould be none found in his See who ſhould do it.* Is not here an excellent Conjunction disjunctive in this *Sive*? Or, that he ſhould not do it *himſelf*, *or*, that his *Succeſſors* ſhould not do it? Doth not this want pregnant Proofs? And we have them in the next Words. *The firſt of theſe, it may be* (very modeſtly!) *did not deſcend to his Succeſſors*; *but* ſecundum, ſine Dubio, manavit ad poſteros ſive Succeſſores; *the ſecond, without all doubt, did deſcend to his Succeſſors.* Are not theſe pregnant Reaſons; *three ſine dubio's* given us by *Cardinal Bellarmine*? For when he comes to confirm this laſt *ſine dubio*, he produces nothing but thoſe Teſtimonies, which his Lordſhip excepts againſt, as not fit to be Judges in their own Cauſe. If theſe then be *Bellarmine*'s pregnant Reaſons out of the Text, no wonder that his Lordſhip was not pleaſed to Anſwer them. But yet you are diſpleaſed, that *his Lordſhip ſhould think that Pope's were intereſſed Perſons in their own Cauſe.* No, no; all that ever ſat in that *See*, were ſuch holy, meek, humble, ſelf-denying men, that they would not for a World, let a Word fall to exalt their own

Bell. de Pontif. l. 4. c. 3.

Authority

Authority in the *Church*. And we are mightily to blame to think otherwiſe of them. Is it poſſible to think that *Felix* I. and *Lucius* I. ſhould ſpeak for their own Intereſt; though the *Epiſtles* under their Names be ſuch notorious Conterfeits, that all ſober Men among you are aſhamed of them? It is poſſible that *Leo* I. ſhould do it, who was ſo humble a Man, that he contended with 630 *Biſhops* of the *Council of Chalcedon* about the *Primacy* of his *See*; and whoſe *Epiſtles* breath ſo much of *Self-denial* in all the Conteſts he had about it? And although *Pope Agatho* and the reſt be of later ſtanding, when the *Popes* did begin a little more openly to take upon them; yet, Can the *Proteſtants* think that theſe men were *byaſſed* with their proper *Intereſt? Are not theſe weak Pretences for them to reject their Authority upon? For your part* (you ſay,) *you could never underſtand this Proceeding of Proteſtants.* The more a great deal is the Pity; and if we could help your Underſtanding and not endanger our own, we would willingly do it. Well, but though *Bellarmine*'s pregnant Reaſons prove ſo abortive, and though the *Pope*'s Authorities ſhould not be taken, yet his Lordſhip muſt needs wrong *Bellarmine*, in ſaying, *That he doth upon the Matter confeſs, that there is not one Father in the Church diſintereſted in the Cauſe, who underſtands this Text as* Bellarmine *doth, before* Theophylact. And the reaſon is, *becauſe, though* Bellarmine *cite no more, yet there might be more for all that: for, muſt he needs confeſs, there are no more Authors citable in any Subject, but what he cites himſelf?* As though *Bellarmine* were wont to leave out any Authorities which made for his Purpoſe, eſpecially in ſo weighty a ſubject as this? Do you think he was ſo weak a Perſon to run to *Pope's Authorities*, if he could have found any other? And when he produces no more, is it not a plain Confeſſion he found no more to his Purpoſe? But I am weary of ſuch great Impertinencies; and would fain meet with ſome Thing of Matter that might hold up the Readers Patience as well as mine. All that ever I can meet with, that hath any Thing of Tendency that way, is, *That this Privilege of the Indeficiency of St.* Peter's *Faith doth not bolong to him as an Apoſtle, but rather as he was Prince of the Apoſtles, and appointed to be Chriſt's Vicar on Earth after him.* Very handſomly begged again! But where is the Proof for all this? Have you no *Popes* ſtand ready again to atteſt the Truth of it? For none elſe that have any Reaſon would ever ſay it? Did St. *Peter* deny Chriſt as *Prince* of the *Apoſtles*? Indeed it was then much for his Honour that the *Captain* ſhould fly from his Colours firſt? and *Chriſt's Vicar upon Earth* ſhould the moſt need to have his *Faith* prayed for, that it ſhould not fail? I had thought St. *Peter* had been Head of the *Apoſtles*, and not *Simon:* If Chriſt had ſpoke to him as his *Vicar*, he would ſure have call'd him *Peter, Peter*, and not *Simon, Simon.* But it ſeems he did not attend, that *Peter was the Rock, on which his Church muſt be built:* Or elſe he minded it ſo much, that he thought that Name improper when he mentions his falling: You have therefore ſtoutly and unanſwerably (not proved, but) demonſtrated that theſe Words were ſpoken of St. *Peter*, not as an *Apoſtle*, but as *Chriſt's Vicar upon Earth.*

P. 209.

But ſuppoſe it were ſo; what is this to thoſe who pretend to be his Succeſſors? *Yes very much. For* (ſay you), *Whatever our Saviour intended ſhould deſcend by Virtue of that Prayer of his, did effectively ſo deſcend.* You might have put one of *Bellarmine*'s *ſine dubio's* to this. For, Whoever was ſo ſenſleſs as to queſtion that? But you confeſs, *It is a very diſputable Queſtion, Whether every thing which Chriſt by his Prayer intended and obtained for St.* Peter, *was likewiſe intended by him to deſcend to St.* Peter's *Succeſſours. Yet that ſome ſpecial Privilege was to deſcend to them, is, you ſay, manifeſt by*

P. 3.

Bellarmine's *Authorities and Reasons.* If from nothing else, I dare confidently say, No Man in his Wits will believe it manifest. And what that is, neither you, nor any one else can either prove or understand. *Yes* (say you) *it is, that none of his Successors should ever so far fall from the Faith, as to teach Heresie,* in Pontificalibus, or, as you speak with *Bellarmine, any thing contrary to Faith* tanquam Pontifex; *i. e. in Virtue of that Authority which they were to have in the Church as St.* Peter's *Successors.* Here then we fix a while to see this proved; but our Expectation is again frustrated: For instead of Proofs we meet with the old *Mumpsimus*, of the *Pope's erring as private Doctor, but not as Pastor of the Church:* A Distinction so ridiculous, that many among your selves deride it, as will appear presently. And
P. 210. therefore put in your *tanquam Pontifex* as long as you please, you will gain no great Matter by it. When you can prove that Christ did intend in that one Prayer, some part of the Gift *personally* and *absolutely* to St. *Peter*, and another part *conditionally to his Successors*, I will grant it no Absurdity to say, that *perhaps some part of the Gift did not belong to either of them.* But these are such strange Fetches out of a plain *Scripture*, that those may admire your Subtilty, who cannot be convinced by your Reason. Yet to let you see that these Things are not so clear as you would have them, I shall bring you some Arguments out of your own Writers against your Interpretation of this Place, and I pray Answer them at your Leisure. *Vigorius* therefore proves that this Place cannot be understood of St. *Peter and his Successors*, that their Faith should not fail; for then saith he, 1. *The Canons had decreed to no purpose that a Pope might be deposed in Case of Heresie; for those that suppose that he may fall into Heresie, do doubtless suppose that his Faith fails.* Now here is a Witness against you, from your own *Church* and that out of your *Canons* too; and that is better worth than twenty *Testimonies* of Popes for you. 2. If this were understood of St. *Peter*'s *Successors, they who succeeded him at* Antioch *would enjoy this Privilege as well as those at* Rome; for they are, saith he, as well St. *Peter*'s Successors as the other. And, saith he, if they understand this of one and not of the other, *totis faucibus Je der dendos propinarent*, they expose themselves to contempt and laughter. 3. If this were true of St. *Peter*'s *Successors at* Rome, *then the Decrees of one Pope could not be revoked by the other; because, it is impossible they should err in making those Decrees.* But it is not *Vigorius* alone who hath shewed the Weakness of your Arguments from this Place; for our learned Countryman Mr. *White* hath more fully and largely discovered the Weakness of all your Pretences from *Scripture*, *Fathers*, and *Reason*, concerning the *Pope's succeeding St.* Peter *in his Infallibility.* And particularly as to this Place he saith, *That either it concerns the present Danger St.* Peter *was in, or else doth represent what was to be afterwards in the Church; and that it doth primarily and directly relate to St.* Peter's *imminent Tentation, all the Circumstances perswade us; first, Because he is called by his private Name* Simon, *and not by his Apostolical Name* Peter. 2. *Because Christ immediately subjoyns after St.* Peter's *Answer his threefold Denial of him.* 3. *The Event it self makes it appear, by the Apostles Flight, S.* Peter's *Temptation and Fall, his Conversion and Tears when Christ looked on him; and by his confirming the Disciples after Christ's Resurrection, But* (saith he), *if this Place be taken as respecting the future times of the Church, the same thing must be expected in S.* Peter's *Successors, which fell out in S.* Peter *himself*, viz. *that either through Fear, or some other Motive they may be drawn into the shew of Heresie, or into Heresie it self; but so, as either in themselves or their Successors, they should be restored to the Catholick Faith.* But what Reason there

Comment. in ep. Synod. Concil. Basil. c. 7. sect. 3.

Tabula suffr. tab. 10. p. 111.

is

is for this latter Interpretation (though destructive to the Pope's Infallibility) neither doth that Person acquaint us, nor can I possibly understand. All the Evasion that you have to avoid the Force of whatever is brought against you out of this Place, is by conjuring up that rare Distinction of the *Pope's not erring when he defines any thing as matter of Faith.* But see what that same Person saith of this Distinction of yours, *Excipiunt aliqui*, saith he, *Papam posse esse hæreticum, sed non posse hæresim promulgare. Adeò quidlibet effutire pro libidine, etiam licitum est. Some Answer, that the Pope may be a Heretick, but cannot promulge or define Heresie? So far do Men think it lawful to say what they please. But can any Man*, saith he, *be guilty of so much Incogitancy, as not to see that these things are consequent upon each other; It is a Pear-tree, and therefore it will bear Pears: It is a Vine, and therefore it will bring forth Grapes. Christ saith, An evil Tree cannot bring forth good fruit; but these say, An evil Tree cannot bring forth bad fruit. The Apostle saith, The Wisdom of the Flesh cannot be subject to God; but these say, It cannot but be subject to God.* And then he further presseth, *That they would declare from what Author they brought this Contradiction into the Church of God, lest Men should believe they were inspired by the Father of Lyes when they made it.* Nay he goes further yet in these stinging Expressions, *An putatis licere, in re quæ totum Ecclesiæ statum ad vivum tangit, novitatem adeò inauditam, adeò rationi adversantem, adeò excedentem omnem fidem, ex somniis cerebri vestri inferre? Do you think it lawful, in a matter which toucheth the whole State of the Church to the quick, to produce so unheard of a Novelty, so repugnant to Reason, so far above all Faith, out of the Dreams of your own Brain?* Go now, and answer these Things among your selves? complain not that we account such Evasions silly, absurd, and ridiculous; you see they are accounted so by some of your own Communion (or, at least, who pretend to be so) and those no contemptible Persons neither. But such as have seen so much of the Weakness and Absurdity of your common Doctrine, that they openly and confidently oppose it, and that upon the same Grounds that *Protestants* had done it before them. And I hope, this is much more to our purpose to shew the Insufficiency of these Proofs, than it was for you to produce the Testimonies of several Popes in their own Cause. Which was all the Proof that *Bellarmine* or you had, that these Words are extended to St. *Peter's Successors*, when we bring Men from among your selves, who produce several Reasons, that they ought not to be so interpreted.

Tabul. suffrag. p. 145.

But yet there is another place as pertinent as the former; the celebrated *Pasce oves & agnos*, John 21. 15, 16, 17. *But Sheep and Lambs*, say you, *are Christ's whole Flock. So there are both these*, saith his Lordship, *in every flock that is not of barren Wethers; and every Apostle, and every Apostles Successor hath Charge to feed both Sheep and Lambs; that is, weaker and stronger Christians, not People and Pastors, Subjects and Governours, as* A. C. *expounds it to bring the necks of Princes under the Roman Pride. No* (say you) *no such Charge is given to any other Apostles, in the Places his Lordship cites*, Matth. 28. 19. Matth. 10. 17. *for these speak of Persons unbaptized, but that place of* S. John, *of those who were actually Christ's Flock; and the Words being absolutely and indefinitely pronounced, must be understood generally and indefinitely of all Christ's Sheep and Lambs, that is, of all Christians whatsoever, not excepting the Apostles themselves; unless it appear from some other place, that the other Apostles had the feeding of all Christ's Sheep, as universally and unlimitedly committed to them, as they were here to* S. Peter. But all this is nothing, as *Vigorius* speaks about the *solvere, ligare, pascere*,

ô. 4. P. 211. P. 191.

but

Ego. p. 61. but *dudum explosis cantilenis aures Christianorum obtundere*, to bring us those things over and over, which have been answered as oft as they have been brought. For how often have you been told, that these Words contain no particular *Commission* to S. *Peter*, but a more vehement *Exhortation* to the discharge of his Duty, and that pressed with the quickness of the Question before it, *Lovest thou me?* How often, that the full *Commis-*
John 20. 21. *sion* to the *Apostles* was given before? *As the Father hath sent me, so send I you.* And that, as Christ was by his Father's Appointment the chief *Shepherd* of the *Sheep* and *Lambs* too; so Christ by this equal Commission to all the *Apostles* gives them all an equal Power and Authority to govern his *Flock:* How often, that nothing appears consequent upon this, whereby St. *Peter* took this Office upon him? But that afterwards we find St. *Peter*
Gal. 2. 7. call'd the *Apostle of the Circumcision*, which certainly he would never have been, had he been looked on as the *Universal Pastor of the Church*; we
Acts 8. 14. find the *Apostles* sending St. *Peter* to *Samaria*, which was a very unmannerly Action, if they looked on him as *Head of the Church.* How often, that these indefinite Expressions are not exclusive of the *Pastoral Charge* of
Mark 6. 16. other *Apostles* over the *Flock* of *Christ?* When they are not only bid *to preach the Gospel to every Creature*, but even those *Bishops* which they ordained in
Acts 20. 28. several *Churches* are charged to *feed the Flock*; and therefore certainly the *Apostles* themselves had not only a charge to Preach to unbaptized Persons (as you suppose) but to govern the *Flock* of those who were actually *Christ's Sheep and Lambs*, as well as St. *Peter*? How often, I say, have you been told all these and several other things in Answer to this Place; and have you yet the Confidence to object it, as though it had never been taken notice of, without ever offering to take off those Answers which have been so frequently given? But you must be pardoned in this, as in all other things of an equal Impossibility.

§. 5. Well, but his Lordship objects a shrewd Consequence from this Universal Pastorship; *that this brings the Necks of Princes under the Roman*
P. 191. *Pride. And if Kings be meant*, (his Lordship saith) *yet the Command is*, pasce, *feed them*; *but* deponere, *or* occidere, *to depose or kill them*, *is not*
Ibid. pascere *in any Sense*; Lanii id est, non Pastoris, *that's the Butchers, not the Shepherd's part. This*, you call, *his Lordship's winding about, and falling upon that odious Question of killing and deposing Kings.* An odious Question indeed, whether we consider the Grounds, or the Effects and Consequents of it. But yet you would seem to clear your selves from the *odium* of it. *First, By saying that it is a gross Fallacy to argue* à negatione speciei ad negationem generis, *which is a new kind of Logick.* It is indeed, for it is of your own coyning; for his Lordship argues *ab affirmatione generis ad affirmationem speciei*, and I hope this is no new *Logick*, unless you think he that saith, He who hath Power over all *living Creatures*, hath not thereby Power over *Men* too. His Lordship therefore doth not argue against the Pope's *Universal Supremacy* from the *denyal* of that, but deduces that as a *Consequence* from your Assertion, and Explication of what you mean by *Sheep and Lambs.* But this is but a slight Answer in Comparison
P. 212. of what follows: *Secondly, we answer, That the Point of Killing Kings, is a most false and scandalous Imputation*; scandalous enough indeed, if false: and though your Popes have not given express Warrant for the doing it, yet it is sufficiently known, How the Pope in Consistory could not contain his Joy when it was done, in the case of *Henry* 3. of *France.* And it hath been sufficiently confessed and lamented by *Persons* of your own Communion, How much the Doctrine of the *Jesuits* hath encou-

raged

raged thoſe *Aſſaſſinations* of thoſe two ſucceſſive *Henries* of *France*. Will you, or dare you vindicate the Doctrines of *Mariana*, and others, which do not obſcurely deliver their Judgment, as to that very thing of *Killing Heretical Princes*? But if we ſhould grant you this, That the Pope *may not command to Kill*, What ſay you to that of *depoſing Princes*? which ſeldom falls much ſhort of the other? As to this, you dare not cry, It is a falſe and ſcandalous Imputation, as you did to the other; but you anſwer, *'Tis no Point of your Faith, that the Pope hath Power to do it; and therefore you ſay it is no part of your Task to diſpute it.* Is this all the Security *Princes* have from you, that it is no Point of your Faith, that the *Pope* hath Power to do it? Is it not well enough known, that there are many things which are held undoubtedly by the greateſt part of your *Church*, which yet you ſay, are no Points of Faith? And yet in this you are directly contradicted by one who knew what were Points of *Faith* among you, as well as you, and that was Father *Creſwell*; whoſe Teſtimony I have cited already; and he ſaith expreſly, *Certum eſt, & de fide*, It is a thing certain, and of Faith: *that the Subjects of an Heretical Prince, are not only freed from Allegiance, but are bound*, ex hominum Chriſtianorum dominatu ejicere, *to caſt him out of his Power*, which certainly is more than the depoſing of him. And *Sanders* plainly enough ſaith, *That a King that will not ſubmit to the Pope's Authority, is by no Means to be ſuffered, but his Subjects ought to do their utmoſt endeavour that another may be placed in his Room.* Indeed, he ſaith not, as the other doth, That this is *de fide*, but that is the only reſerve you have when a Doctrine is odious and infamous to the World, to cry out, It is not *de fide*, when yet it may be as firmly believed among you, as any that you account *de fide*. And if you believe the *Duke* of *Alva* in his *Manifeſto* at the Siege of *Pampelona*, when the Pope had depoſed the King of *Navarre* to whom that City belonged, he ſaith, *That it is not doubted but the Pope had Power to depoſe Heretical Princes.* And if you had been of another Opinion, you ought to have declared your ſelf more fully than you do. If you had ſaid, that indeed ſome were of that Opinion, but you abhorred and deteſted it, you had ſpoken to the purpoſe; but when you uſe only that pitiful Evaſion, *That it is not of Faith*, &c. you ſufficiently ſhew, What your Judgment is, but that you dare not publickly own it. It ſeems, you remember what was ſaid by your Maſters in reference to *Emanuel Sà, non fuit opus ad iſta deſcendere.* There was no need to meddle with thoſe things. It ſeems, if there had been, there was no hurt in the Doctrine, but only that it was unſeaſonable. I pray *God* keep us from that time, when you ſhall think it *needful* to declare your ſelves in this Point. But you conclude this with a moſt unworthy and ſcandalous Reflection on *Proteſtants*, in theſe Words; *But what Proteſtants have both done and juſtified in the worſt of theſe kinds, is but too freſh in Memory.* But, were thoſe the Practices and Principles of *Proteſtants*? Were they not abhorred and deteſted in the higheſt manner by all *true Proteſtants*, both at *Home* and *Abroad*? It will be well, if you can clear ſome of your ſelves from having too much a Hand in promoting both thoſe Principles and Practices. I ſuppoſe you cannot but have heard, Who it was is ſaid to have expreſſed ſo much Joy at the time of that horrid Execution; What Counſels and Machinations are ſaid to have been among ſome devoted Sons of the *Church* of *Rome* abroad about that time: Therefore clear your ſelves more than yet you have done, of thoſe Imputations, before you charge that guilt on *Proteſtants*, which they expreſs the higheſt Abhorrence of. And let the Names of ſuch who either publickly or privately

Philipator. ſect. 157. p. 149.

De viſib. Monarch. l. 2. c. 4.

Nebriſſenſ. de bello Navarr. l. 1. c. 6.

privately abet or juſtifie ſuch horrid Actions, be under a continual *Anathema* to all *Generations*.

§. 6. After all this Diſcourſe about the *Pope's Authority*, *A. C.* brings it at laſt home to the buſineſs of *Schiſm*. For, he ſaith, *The Biſhop of* Rome *ſhall never refuſe to feed and govern the whole Flock in ſuch ſort, as that neither particular Man nor Church ſhall have juſt cauſe, under Pretence of Reformation in Matters of Faith, to make a Separation from the whole Church. This* (his
P. 191. n. 18. Lordſhip ſaith) *by* A. C*'s Favour, is meer begging the Queſtion. For this is the very thing which the Proteſtants charge upon him; namely, that he hath governed, if not the whole, yet ſo much of the Church as he hath been able to bring under his Power, ſo as that he hath given too juſt cauſe of the preſent continued Separation. And, as the Corruptions in the Doctrine of Faith, in the Church of* Rome, *were the cauſe of the firſt Separation; ſo are they at this preſent Day, the cauſe why the Separation continues. And the Oppreſſion of the Church of* Rome, he further adds, *is the great cauſe of all the Errors in that part of the Church which is under the* Roman *Juriſdiction. And for the Proteſtants, they have made no Separation from the General Church properly ſo called, but their Separation is only from the Church of* Rome, *and ſuch other Churches, as by adhering to her, have hazarded themſelves, and do now miſcal themſelves the whole Catholick Church. Nay, even here the Proteſtants have not left the Church of* Rome *in her Eſſence, but in her Errors; not in the Things which conſtitute a Church, but only in ſuch Abuſes and Corruptions, as work towards the Diſſolution of a Church.* Let now any indifferent Reader
P. 212. be judge, Whether his Lordſhip, or *A. C.* be the more guilty *in begging the Queſtion*. For all the Anſwer you can give, is, *That his Lordſhip begs it, in ſaying that the* Roman *Church is not the whole Catholick Church, and that the* Roman *Catholick Church may be in an Error*; but the former we have proved already, and I doubt not but the latter will be as evident as the other, before our Task be ended. But, as though it were not poſſible for you to be guilty of *begging the Queſtion*, after you have ſaid that the *Roman Church cannot err*, you give this as the reaſon for it, *Becauſe ſhe is the unſhaken Rock of Truth; and that ſhe hath the ſole continual Succeſſion of lawfully ſent Paſtors and Teachers, who have taught the ſame unchanged Doctrine, and ſhall infallibly continue ſo teaching it to the World's end.* Now, Who dares call this *Begging the Queſtion?* No, it muſt not be called ſo in you, it ſhall be only *Taking it for granted.* Which we have ſeen, hath been your Practice all along, eſpecially when we charge your *Church* with Error; for then you cry out preſently, What, *your Church err?* No, you defie the Language. What, *the Spouſe of Chriſt, the Catholick Church err?* that is impoſſible. What, the *unſhaken Rock of Truth* to ſink into Errors? the *Infallible Church* be deceived? She that hath never taught any thing but Truth, be charged with Falſhood? She, that not only *never did err*, but, it is *impoſſible*, nay, utterly *impoſſible*, nay, ſo *impoſſible*, that it *cannot be imagined*, that ever *ſhe ſhould err?* This is the ſum of all your Arguments, which, no doubt, ſound high to all ſuch who know not what confident begging the Queſtion means, or, out of Modeſty, are loth to charge you with it.

Much to the ſame purpoſe do you go on, to prove, *that Proteſtants have ſeparated not from the Errors, but the Eſſence of your Church.* And if that be true, which you ſay, *That thoſe Things which we call Errors are eſſential to your Church*, we are the more ſorry for it; for we are ſure, (and, when you pleaſe, will prove it) that they are not, cannot be, eſſential to a *true Church*; and if they be to yours, the caſe is ſo much the worſe with you, when

when your Diſtempers are in your Vitals, and your Errors eſſential to your *Church's Conſtitution.* What other things you have here, are the bare Repetitions of what we have often had before in the *Chapters* you refer us to. And here we may thank you for ſome eaſe you give us in the far greateſt remaining part of this *Chapter*, which conſiſts of tedious Repetitions of ſuch things which have been largely diſcuſſed in the *Firſt part*, where they were purpoſely and deſignedly handled; as that concerning *Traditions, chap.* 6. that *concerning Neceſſaries to Salvation, chap.* 2, 3, 4. N. 3. that concerning the *Scriptures being an Infallible Rule*, throughout the Controverſie of *Reſolution of Faith*; and that which concerns *the Infallibility of* N. 8. *General Councils*, we ſhall have occaſion at large to handle afterwards; and N. 57. if there be any thing material here, which you omit there, it ſhall be fully conſidered. But I know no Obligation lying upon me to anſwer things as often as you repeat them, eſpecially ſince your Gift is ſo good that way. It is ſufficient that I know not of any material Paſſage, which hath not received an Anſwer in its proper place.

That which is moſt pertinent to our preſent purpoſe, is that which concerns *the neceſſity of a Living Judge, beſides the Scriptures for ending Controverſies of Faith.* As to which his Lordſhip ſaith, *That, ſuppoſing there were* P. 198. n. 6. *ſuch a one, and the Pope were he, yet that is not ſufficient againſt the Malice of the Devil, and impious Men, to keep the Church at all times from renting even in the Doctrine of Faith, or to ſoder the Rents which are made. For*, oportet eſſe Hæreſes, 1 Cor. 11. 19. *Hereſies there will be, and Hereſies there properly cannot* P. 218. *be but in the Doctrine of Faith.* To this you anſwer, *That Hereſies are not within, but without the Church, and the Rents which ſtand in need of ſodering, are not found among the true Members of the Church, who continue ſtill united in the Faith, and due Obedience to their Head; but in thoſe who have deſerted the true Church, and either made or adhered to Schiſmatical and Heretical Congregations.* A moſt excellent Anſwer! His Lordſhip ſays, If Chriſt had appointed an *Infallible Judge* beſides the *Scripture*, certainly it ſhould have been for preventing *Hereſies*, and ſodering the Rents of the Church. *So it is* (ſay you) *for if there be any Hereſies, it is nothing to him, they are out of the Church; and if there be any Schiſms, they are among thoſe who are divided from him*: That is, he is an *Infallible Judge* only thus far, in condemning all ſuch for *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, who do not own him. And his only way of preventing *Hereſies* and *Schiſms*, is the making this the only trial of them, that whatever queſtions his *Authority*, is *Hereſie*; and whatever Separation be made from him, is *Schiſm.* Juſt 2 Sam. 15. 2. as *Abſalom* pretended that there was no *Judge* appointed *to hear and determine Cauſes*, and that the *Laws* were not ſufficient without one, and therefore he would do it himſelf; ſo doth the *Pope* by *Chriſt*, he pretends that he hath not taken care ſufficient for deciding Controverſies in Faith, therefore there is a neceſſity in order to the Churches *Unity*, he ſhould take it upon himſelf. But now, if we ſuppoſe in the former caſe of *Abſalom*, that he had pretended he could infallibly end all the Controverſies in *Iſrael*, and keep all in Peace and Unity; and yet abundance of Controverſies to ariſe among them *by what Right and Power he took that Office upon him*, and many of them cry out upon it, as an *Uſurpation*, and a Diſparagment to the *Laws* and *Government* of his *Father David*; and upon this, ſome of the wiſer *Iſraelites* ſhould have asked him, Whether this were the way to end all *Controverſies*, and keep the Nation in Peace? Would it not have been a ſatisfactory Anſwer for him to have ſaid, Yes, no doubt it is the only way; *For, only they that acknowledge my Power, are the King's lawful*

Subjects, and all the reſt are Rebels and Traytors. And, Is not this juſt the ſame Anſwer which you give here? *That the Pope is ſtill appointed to keep Peace and Unity in the Church, becauſe all that queſtion his Authority, be Hereticks and Schiſmaticks.* But, as in the former caſe, the ſureſt way to prevent thoſe Conſequences, were to produce that Power and Authority which the *King* had given him, and that ſhould be the firſt thing which ſhould be made evident from authentick Records, and the clear Teſtimony of the graveſt *Senators*; ſo, if you could produce the *Letters Patents*, whereby *Chriſt* made the *Pope* the great *Lord Chancellor* of his *Church*, to determine all *Controverſies* of *Faith*, and ſhew this atteſted by the concurrent Voice of the *Primitive Church*, who beſt knew what Order Chriſt took for the Government of his *Church*; this were a way to prevent ſuch Perſons turning ſuch *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, as you ſay they are, by not ſubmitting themſelves to the Pope's *Authority*. But for you to pretend that the Pope's *Authority* is neceſſary to the *Church's Unity*, and when the *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* of the *Church* are objected, to ſay, That thoſe are all out of the *Church*, is juſt as if a *Shepherd* ſhould ſay, That he would keep the *whole Flock* of *Sheep* within ſuch a *Fold*, and when the better half are ſhewed him to be out of it, he ſhould return this Anſwer, That thoſe were without, and not within his Fold; and therefore they were none of the *Flock* that he meant. So that his meaning was, *thoſe that would abide in, he could keep in, but for thoſe that would not, he had nothing to ſay to them.* So it is with you, the Pope he ends Controverſies, and keeps the *Church* at *Unity*; How ſo? They who do agree, are of his *Flock*, and of the *Church*; and thoſe that do not, are out of it. A *Quaker* or *Anabaptiſt* will keep the *Church in Unity* after the ſame way, only the Pope hath the greater Number of his ſide; for, they will tell you, If they were hearkened to, the *Church* ſhould never be in *Pieces*; for all thoſe who embrace their *Doctrines*, are of the *Church*, and thoſe who do not, are *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*. So we ſee upon your Principles, What an eaſie matter it is to be an *Infallible Judge*, and to end all *Controverſies* in the *Church*; that only this muſt be taken for granted, that all who will not own ſuch an *infallible Judge*, are out of the *Church*, and ſo the *Church* is at *Unity* ſtill, how many ſoever there are who doubt or deny the Pope's *Authority*. Thus we eaſily underſtand what that excellent Harmony is, which you cry ſo much up in your *Church*; that you moſt gravely ſay, *That, had not the Pope received from God the Power he challenges, he could never have been able to preſerve that Peace and Unity in Matters of Religion, that is found in the* Roman *Church:* Of what nature that Unity is, we have ſeen already: And ſurely you have much cauſe to boaſt of the Pope's Faculty of deciding Controverſies, ever ſince the late *Decree* of Pope *Innocent*, in the caſe of the *five Propoſitions*. For, How readily the *Janſeniſts* have ſubmitted ſince, and what Unity there hath been among the diſſenting Parties in *France*, all the World can bear you witneſs. And, whatever you pretend, *were it not for Policy and Intereſt*, the Infallible Chair would ſoon fall to the Ground; for it hath ſo little footing in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, that there had need be a watchful Eye, and ſtrong Hand to keep it up.

§. 9. But now we are to examine the main Proof which is brought for the neceſſity of this *Living and Infallible Judge*; which lies in theſe Words of *A. C. Every earthly Kingdom, when Matters cannot be compoſed by a Parliament (which cannot be called upon all Occaſions) hath, beſides the Law-Books, ſome living Magiſtrates and Judges, and above all one viſible King, the higheſt Judge, who hath Authority ſufficient to end all Controverſies, and ſettle Unity*

in

in all Temporal Affairs. And, Shall we think that Christ, the wisest King, hath provided in his Kingdom the Church, only the Law-Books of holy Scripture, and no living visible Judges, and above all one chief, so assisted by his Spirit, as may suffice to end all Controversies for Unity and Certainty of Faith? which can never be, if every Man may interpret Holy Scripture, the Law-Books, as he list. This, his Lordship saith, *is a very plausible Argument with the many; but the Foundation of it is but a Similitude, and, if the Similitude hold not in the main, Argument is nothing.* And so his Lordship at large proves that it is here. For whatever further concerns this Controversie concerning the Pope's *Authority*, is brought under the Examination of this Argument; which you mangle into *several Chapters*, thereby confounding the *Reader*, that he may not see the Coherence or Dependence of one thing upon another. But having cut off the Superfluities of this *Chapter* already, I may with more Conveniency reduce all that belongs to this matter within the compass of it. And that he may the better apprehend his Lordship's Scope and Design, I shall first sum up his Lordship's Answers together, and then more particularly go about the Vindication of them. 1. Then, his Lordship at large proves that the *Militant Church is not properly a Monarchy*, and therefore the Foundation of the Similitude is destroyed. 2. *That supposing it a Kingdom, yet the Church Militant is spread in many earthly Kingdoms, and cannot well be ordered like one particular Kingdom.* 3. *That the Church of* England *under one Supreme Governour, our Gracious Sovereign, hath, besides the Law-Book of the Scripture, visible Magistrates and Judges, Arch-Bishops and Bishops to govern the Church in Truth and Peace.* 4. *That as in particular Kingdoms there are some Affairs of greatest Consequence as concerning the Statute Laws, which cannot be determined but in Parliament; so in the Church, the making such Canons which must bind all Christians, must belong to a free and lawful General Council.* Thus I have laid together the substance of his Lordship's Answer, that the Dependence and Connexion of Things may be better perceived by the intelligent Reader.

P. 199. n. 7.

We come now therefore to the first Answer. As to which his Lordship saith, *It is not certain that the whole Church Militant is a Kingdom; for they are no mean ones which think, our Saviour Christ left the Church-Militant in the Hands of the Apostles, and their Successors, in an Aristocratical, or rather a mixt Government; and that the Church is not Monarchical, otherwise than the Triumphant and Militant make one Body under Christ the Head. And in this Sense indeed, and in this only the Church is a most absolute Kingdom. And the very expressing of this Sense, is a full Answer to all the places of Scripture, and other Arguments brought by* Bellarmine *to prove, that the Church is a Monarchy. But the Church being as large as the World, Christ thought fittest to govern it Aristocratically, by divers, rather than by one Vice-Roy. And I believe,* saith he, *this is true. For so it was governed for the first three hundred Years, and somewhat better; the Bishops of those times carrying the whole Business of admitting any new consecrated Bishops or others to, or rejecting them from their Communion.* And this, his Lordship saith, *He hath carefully examined for the first six hundred Years, even to, and within, the time of S.* Gregory *the Great.* Now to this you answer, 1. *That though* A. C. *urgeth the Argument in a Similitude of a Kingdom only, yet it is of force in any other kind of settled Government, as in a Commonwealth.* But by this *A. C.* seems a great deal the wiser Man, for he knew what he did when he instanced in a *Kingdom*; for he foresaw that this only would tend to his purpose concerning the Pope's *Supremacy*; but though there be the same Necessity of

P. 200.

P. 219.

ſome *Supreme Power* in a *Commonwealth*, yet that would do him no good at all, for all that could be inferred thence, would be the Neceſſity of a *General Council.* And by this you may ſee, How little your Similitude will hold any other way than *A. C.* put it. Therefore, 2. You anſwer, *That the Government of the Church is not a pure, but a mixt Monarchy*, i. e. *the Supream Government of the Church is clearly Monarchical, you confeſs: yet Biſhops within their reſpective Dioceſes and Juriſdictious are ſpiritual Princes alſo, that is, chief Paſtors and Governors of ſuch a part of the Church in their own Right.* How far this latter is conſonant to your Principles, I have already examined, but the former is that we diſpute now, concerning the *Supreme Government of the Church*, Whether that be *Monarchical* or no, and this is that which his Lordſhip denies; and, for all that I ſee, we may continue to do ſo too, for any Argument you bring to the contrary.

§. 9. P. 220. Although you produce your *Achilles* in the next Paragraph, *viz. that ſince the Government of one in chief, is by all Philoſophers acknowledged for the moſt perfect, What wonder is it that Chriſt our Saviour thought it fitter to govern the Church by one Vice-Roy, than Ariſtocratically, or by many, as he would have it?* But, Are you ſure Chriſt asked the *Philoſophers* Opinions, in eſtabliſhing a Government in the *Church*? The *Philoſophers* judged truly that of all *Forms* of Civil Government, *Monarchy* was the beſt, *i. e.* moſt conducing to the *Ends* of Civil Government: for the *Excellency* of ſuch things muſt be meaſured by their reſpect to the *Ends.* Now, if we apply this to the *Church*, we muſt not meaſure it by ſuch *Ends*, as we fanſie to our ſelves, or ſuch as are only the ends of meer Civil Societies; but all muſt be conſidered with a reſpect to the chief *Deſign* of him who firſt inſtituted a *Church.* And from thence we muſt draw our Inferences, as to what may tend moſt to the *Peace and Unity* of it. Now it appearing to be the great Deſign of *Chriſt*, that Mankind ſhould be brought to eternal Happineſs, we cannot argue from hence, as to the Neceſſity of any manner of *Government*, unleſs one of them hath in it ſelf a greater Tendency to this than another hath. For in Civil Governments, the whole Deſign of the *Society*, is the *Civil Peace* of it; but it is otherwiſe in the *Church*, the main end of it, is to order Things with the greateſt Conveniency for a *future Life*: Now this being the main end of this Society, and no manner of *Government* having in it ſelf a greater Tendency to this than other; It was in the Power of the *Legiſlator*, to appoint what *Government* he pleaſed himſelf. But when we conſider that he intended this *Church* of his ſhould be ſpread all over the World, and this to be his immediate Errand he ſent his *Apoſtles* upon, *to preach to every Creature*, and to plant *Churches* in the moſt remote and diſtant Places from each other; we cannot have the leaſt ground to fanſie he ſhould appoint an *Univerſal Monarchy* in his *Church* of any Government whatſoever. For if we will take that Boldneſs you put us upon, to enquire, What form is fitteſt for a *Society* diſperſed into all *Parts* of the *World*, and that are not bound, upon their being *Chriſtians*, to live nearer *Rome*, than *Mexico* or *Japan*; Could any one imagine it would be, to appoint one *Vice-Roy* to ſuperintend his *Church* at ſuch a place as *Rome* is? Suppoſe all the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies* conſiſted of Chriſtian *Churches*, What Advantage, in order to the Government of thoſe *Churches*, could the Pope's *Authority* be? What *Hereſies* and *Schiſms* might be among them before his *Holineſs* could be acquainted with them? Theſe are therefore very ſlender and narrow Conceptions concerning *Chriſt's Inſtitution* of a *Government* over his *Catholick Church*, as though he ſhould only have regard to theſe few adjacent parts of *Europe*, without any reſpect to the good

good of the whole Church. But ſince we ſee, *Chriſt* deſigned ſuch a *Church* which might be in moſt remote and diſtant Places from each other, and yet at ſuch a Diſtance might equally promote the main Ends, wherefore they became Churches, it is very unreaſonable to think he ſhould appoint one *Vice-Roy* to be *Head* over them all. For which, let us ſuppoſe, that *Europe* might be (as the *Eaſtern Churches* have been) over-run with the *Turkiſh* Power, and only ſome few ſuffering *Chriſtians* left here, and the *Pope* much in the ſame Condition with the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*: But on the other ſide, that *Chriſtianity* ſhould largely ſpread it ſelf in *China*, and the *Eaſt Indies*, and the *Chriſtian Church* flouriſh in *America*. Could any *Philoſopher* think that fixing a *Monarchy* at *Rome*, or elſewhere, were the beſt way to *Govern* the *Catholick Church*, which conſiſts of all theſe *Chriſtian Societies*? For that is certainly the beſt *Government* which is ſuited to all Conditions of that *Society*, which it is intended for; now it is apparent the *Chriſtian Church* was intended to be ſo *Catholick*, that no one *Vice-Roy* can be ſuppoſed able to look to the *Government* of it. If Chriſt had intended meerly ſuch a *Church* which ſhould have conſiſted of ſuch Perſons which lay here near about *Rome*, and no others, the Suppoſition of ſuch a Monarchy in the *Church* would not have been altogether ſo incongruous (tho' liable to very many Inconveniencies): But when he intended his *Religion* for the univerſal good of the World, and that in all Parts of it, without obliging them to live near each other, it is one of the moſt unreaſonable Suppoſitions in the World, that he ſhould ſet up a *Monarchical Government* over his *Catholick Church* in ſuch a Place as *Rome* is. But now, if we ſuppoſe only an *Ariſtocratical Government* in the *Church* under *Chriſt* as the alone *Supreme Head*; nothing can be more ſuitable to the Nature of the *Church*, or the large extent of it, than that is. For where-ever a *Church* is, there may be *Biſhops* to govern it, and other Officers of the *Church* to over-ſee the leſſer Parts of it, and all join to promote the Peace and Unity of it, which they may with the more eaſe do, if no one challenge to be *Supreme Head*, to whom belongs the chief Care of the Church. For by this Means they cannot with that Power and Authority redreſs Abuſes, and preſerve the *Churches Purity* and *Peace*, which otherwiſe they might have done. So that conſidering barely the Nature of Things, nothing ſeems more repugnant to the end for which Chriſt inſtituted a Catholick Church, than ſuch a *Monarchy* as you imagine; and nothing more ſuitable than an *Ariſtocracy*? conſidering that Chriſtian Churches may be much diſperſed abroad, and that where they are, they are incorporated into that Civil Society in which they live (according to the known ſaying of *Optatus*, *Eccleſia eſt in republicâ*, &c.) and therefore ſuch a *Monarchy* would be unſuitable to the civil *Governments* in which thoſe *Churches* may be. For it were eaſie to demonſtrate, that ſuch a *Monarchy* as you challenge in the *Church*, is the moſt inconvenient *Government* for it, take the Church in what way, or ſenſe you pleaſe; Whether, as to its own Peace and Order, or to its ſpreading into other Churches, or to the Reſpect it muſt have to the Civil Government it lives under. And, if we would more largely enquire into theſe Things, we might eaſily find, that thoſe which you look on as the great Ends, wherefore Chriſt ſhould inſtitute ſuch a Monarchical Government in his Church, are things unſuitable to the Nature of a *Chriſtian Church*; and which Chriſt, as far as we can judge, did never intend to take Care, that they ſhould never be; which are, Freedom from all kind of *Controverſies*, and abſolute Submiſſion of *Judgment* to the Decrees of an *Infallible Judge*. We no where find ſuch a State of a *Chriſtian Church*

Church deſcribed or promiſed, where Men ſhall all be of one Mind (only that Peace and brotherly Love be continued, is that, all Chriſtians are bound to); much leſs certainly, that this *Unity* ſhould be by a Submiſſion of our Underſtandings to an *Infallible Judge*, of whom we read Nothing in that Book which perſwades us to be *Chriſtians*; and without which Freedom of our Underſtandings (which this pretended Infallibility would deprive us of) we could never have been Judicious and Rational *Chriſtians*.

§. 10. But granting that wiſe Men have thought *Monarchy the beſt Government in its ſelf*; What is this to the proving, what *Government Chriſt hath appointed in his Church*? For that is the beſt Government for the *Church*; not which *Philoſophers* and *Politicians* have thought beſt, but which our *Saviour* hath appointed in his Word. For he certainly knew beſt, what would ſuit with the Conveniences of his *Church*. And theſe are bold and inſolent Diſputes, wherein thoſe of your ſide argue, *That Chriſt muſt have inſtituted a Monarchy in his Church, becauſe all Philoſophers have judged That the moſt perfect Government*. I need not tell you what theſe Speeches imply *Chriſt* to be, if he doth not follow the *Philoſopher's* Judgment. Will you give him leave to judge what is fitteſt for his *Church* himſelf? Or do you think he hath not Wiſdom enough to do it, unleſs the *Philoſophers* inſtruct him? Let us therefore appeal to his *Laws* to ſee what *Government* he hath there appointed. And now I ſhall deal more cloſely with you. You tell me, *therein Chriſt hath appointed this Monarchical Government*. But I may be nearer your Mind, when you will Anſwer me theſe following Queſtions. When, and where did any wiſe *Legiſlator* appoint a Matter of ſo vaſt Concernment to the good of the *Society*, as the *Supreme Government* of it, and expreſs no more of it in his *Laws*, than *Chriſt* hath done of this *Monarchical Government* of the *Church*? Is there not particular Care taken in all Laws about that, to expreſs the *Rights* of *Sovereignty*, to hinder *Uſurpations*, to bind all to Obedience, to determine the Way of Succeſſion by Deſcent or Election? And hath *Chriſt* inſtituted a *Monarchy* in his *Church* and ſaid nothing of all theſe Things? When the utmoſt you can pretend to, are ſome ambiguous Places, which you muſt have the Power of Interpreting your *ſelves*, or they ſignifie nothing to your Purpoſe. So that none of the *Fathers*, or the *Primitive Church* for ſeveral *Centuries*, could find out ſuch Myſteries in *ſuper hanc Petram*, *dabo tibi Claves*, and *paſce oves*, as you have done. If ſuch a *Monarchy* had been appointed in the *Church*, what ſhould we have had more frequent Mention of in the *Records* of the *Church*, than of this? Where do we meet with any *Hiſtories* that write the Affairs of *Kingdoms* for ſome Hundreds of Years, and never mention any *Royal Acts* of the *Kings* of them? If S. *Peter*'s being at *Rome* had ſettled the *Monarchy* of the *Church* there, what more famous Act could have been mentioned in all *Antiquity* than that? What Notice would have been taken by other *Churches* of *him* whom he had left his Succeſſor? What Addreſſes would have been made to him by the *Biſhops* of other *Churches*? What Teſtimonies of Obedience and Submiſſion; what Appeals and Reſort thither? And it is wonderful ſtrange that the *Hiſtories* of the *Church* ſhould be ſilent in theſe grand Affairs, when they report many minute Things, even during the hotteſt Times of Perſecution. Did the Chriſtians conſpire together in thoſe Times not to let their Poſterity know, Who had the *Supream Government* of the *Church* then? Or were they afraid the *Heathen Emperors* ſhould be jealous of the *Popes*, if they had underſtood their great Authority? But then methinks they

they ſhould have carried it however among themſelves with all Reverence and Submiſſion to the Pope, and not openly oppoſe him as ſoon as ever he began to exerciſe any Authority, as in the Caſe of *Victor* and the *Aſian Biſhops*. But of all things, it ſeems moſt ſtrange and unaccountable to me, that *Chriſt* ſhould have inſtituted ſuch a *Monarchy* in his *Church*, and none of the *Apoſtles* mention any thing of it in any of the *Epiſtles* which they writ, in which are ſeveral Things concerning the *Peace* and *Government* of the *Church*: Nay, when there were *Schiſms* and *Diviſions* in the *Church*, and that on the Account of their Teachers, among whom *Cephas* was one (by that very Name on which *Chriſt* ſaid *he would build his Church*) and yet no mention of Reſpect more to *him* than to any other: No Intimation of what Power St. *Peter* had for the Government of the Church, as the *Head* and *Monarch* of it: No References at all made to him by any of the divided Parties of the *Church* at that time: No mention at all of any ſuch Power given him in the *Epiſtles* written by him, but he writes juſt as any other *Apoſtle* did, with great Expreſſions of Humility; and, as if he foreſaw what *Uſurpations* would be in the Church, he forbids any *Lording it over God's Heritage*, and calls *Chriſt the chief Paſtor of the Church*. And this he doth in an Epiſtle not writ to the *Catholick Church*, which had been moſt proper for him if *Head of the Church*, but only to the diſperſed *Jews* in ſome particular Provinces. Can any one then imagine he ſhould be *Monarch* of the *Church*, and no Act of his, as ſuch, recorded at all of him; but carrying himſelf with all Humility, not fixing himſelf as *Head of the Church* in any *Chair*, but going up and down from one Place to another, as the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, for promoting the *Goſpel of Chriſt*. To conclude all; Is it poſſible to conceive there ſhould be a *Monarch* appointed by *Chriſt* in the *Church*, and yet the *Apoſtle* when he reckons upon thoſe Offices which *Chriſt* had ſet in the *Church*, ſpeak not one Word of him? He mentions *Apoſtles*, *Prophets*, *Evangeliſts*, *Paſtors and Teachers*; but the Chief of all is omitted, and he to whom the Care of all the reſt is committed; and in whoſe Authority the Welfare, Peace, and Unity of the Church is ſecured. Theſe Things to me ſeem ſo incredible, that till you have ſatisfied my Mind in theſe *Queſtions*, I muſt needs judge this pretended *Monarchy* in the *Church* to be one of the greateſt *Figments* ever were in the Chriſtian World. And thus I have at large conſidered your Argument from *Reaſon*, Why there ſhould be ſuch a *Monarchy* in the *Church*; which I have the rather done, becauſe it is one of the great Things in diſpute between us, and becauſe the moſt plauſible Argument brought for it, is, *The Neceſſity of it in order to the Church's Peace*, which *Monarchy* being the beſt of *Governments* would the moſt tend to promote. To return now to his Lordſhip.

Eph. 4. 11.

§. 11. P. 201.

He brings an Evidence out of Antiquity againſt the Acknowledgement of any ſuch *Monarchy* in the *Church from the* literæ communicatoriæ, *which certified from one great Patriarch to another, Who were fit or unfit to be admitted to their Communion, upon any occaſion of repairing from one See to another. And theſe were ſent mutually, and as freely in the ſame manner from* Rome *to the other Patriarchs, as from them to it. Out of which* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *I think this will follow moſt directly, that the Church Government then was Ariſtocratical. For had the Biſhop of* Rome *been then accounted ſole Monarch of the Church, and been put into the Definition of the Church* (*as he is now by* Bellarmine) *all theſe communicatory Letters ſhould have been directed from him to the reſt, as whoſe Admittance ought to be a Rule for all to communicate; but not from others to him, at leaſt not in that even equal brotherly way, as now they appear to be written. For it is no way probable the Biſhops of* Rome

which

which even then ſought their own greatneſs too much, would have ſubmited to the other Patriarchs voluntarily, had not the very Courſe of the Church put it upon them. To this you Anſwer, *That theſe* literæ communicatoriæ *do rather prove our Aſſertion, being ordained by* Sixtus I. *in favour of ſuch Biſhops as were called to* Rome, *or otherwiſe forced to repair thither; to the end they might without Scruple, be received into their own Dioceſe at their return: Having alſo decreed, that without ſuch Letters communicatory, none in ſuch Caſe ſhould be admitted. But that theſe Leters ſhould be ſent from other Biſhops to* Rome *in ſuch an even, equal, and brotherly way you ſay, is one of his Lordſhip's Chimæra's. But this Difference or Inequality you pretend to be in them; that thoſe to the Pope were meerly Teſtimonial; thoſe from him were Mandatory, witneſs (*ſay you*) the Caſe of St.* Athanaſius *and other Biſhops reſtored by the Pope's communicatory Letters. But ſuppoſing them equal, you ſay, it only ſhewed the Pope's Humility; and ought to be no Prejudice to his juſt Authority, and his Right and Power to do otherwiſe if he ſaw Cauſe.* But all this depends upon a meer Fiction, *viz. That theſe communicatory Letters were ordained by* Sixtus I. *in favour of ſuch Biſhops as were called to* Rome, *than which nothing can be more improbable.* But I do not ſay, that this is a *Chimæra* of your own Brains, for you follow *Baronius* in it: For which he produceth no other Evidence, but the Author of the *Lives* of the *Popes*: But *Binius* adds that which ſeems to have been the firſt ground of it, which is the ſecond *decretal Epiſtle of* Sixtus I. in which that Decree is extant: But whoſoever conſiders the notorious Forgery of thoſe *decretal Epiſtles* (as will be more manifeſted where you contend for them) on which Account they are ſlighted by *Card. Perron*, and in many Places by *Baronius* himſelf, will find little Cauſe to triumph in this Epiſtle of *Sixtus* I. And whoever reflects on the State of thoſe Times in which *Sixtus* lived, will find it improbable enough, that the *Pope* ſhould take to himſelf ſo much Authority to ſummon *Biſhops* to him, and to order that none ſhould be admitted without *Communicatory Letters* from him. It is not here a Place ro enquire into the ſeveral ſorts of thoſe *Letters* which paſſed among the *Biſhops* of the Primitive *Church*, whether the *Canonical*, *Pacifical*, *Eccleſiaſtical*, and *Communicatory*, were all one; and what Difference there was between the *Communicatory Letters* granted to Travellers, in order to their Communion with foreign Churches, and thoſe Letters which were ſent from one *Patriarch* to another. But this is ſufficiently evident, that thoſe *Letters* which were the *teſſera Hoſpitalitatis*, as *Tertullian* calls it, the Paſs-port for Communion in foreign Churches, had no more reſpect to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, than to any other *Catholick Biſhop*. Therefore the *Council* of *Antioch* paſſeth two *Canons* concerning them; one, *That no Traveller ſhould be received without them*; another, *That none but Biſhops ſhould give them.* And that all Biſhops did equally grant them to all Places, appears by that Paſſage in *S. Auſtin*, in his Epiſtle to *Euſebius* and the other *Dotaniſts*, relating the Conference he had with *Fortunius a Biſhop of that Party*; wherein St. *Auſtin* asked him, *Whether he could give Communicatory Letters whither he pleaſed? For by that Means it might be eaſily determined whether he had Communion with the whole Catholick Church, or no.* From whence it follows, that any *Catholick Biſhop* might without any reſpect to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* grant *Communicatory Letters* to all foreign *Churches*. And the enjoying of that *Communion* which was conſequent upon theſe *Letters*, is all that *Optatus* means in that known Saying of his, That they had Communion with *Siricius* at *Rome*, *commercio formatarum*, by the uſe of theſe *Communicatory Letters*. But beſides theſe, there were other Letters, which every *Patriarch* ſent

P. 220.

Baron. Annal. A. D. 142. ſ. 6. Bin. Concil. To. 1. p. 74.

Baron An. 865. ſect. 5. 8.

Concil Antioc. can. 7, 8.

Aug. Epiſt. 163.

Optat. l. 2.

ſent to the reſt upon his firſt Inſtallment, which were call'd their *Synodical Epiſtles*, and theſe contained the Profeſſion of their Faith; and the Anſwers to them did denote their *Communion* with them. Since therefore theſe were ſent to all the *Patriarchs* indifferently, and not barely to the *Biſhop of Rome*; there appears no difference at all in the Letters ſent to or from him and the other *Patriarchs* on this Occaſion. As for your inſtance of the Pope's *reſtoring* Athanaſius, I have ſufficiently anſwered it already; and if the Pope's Letter were never ſo *Mandatory* (as it was not) yet we ſee it took no effect among the *Eaſtern Biſhops:* and therefore they were of his Lordſhip's Mind, *That the Government of the Church was not Monarchical, but Ariſtocratical.* I did expect here to have met with the pretended Epiſtle of *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, about the manner of making *formed Letters*, wherein one Pope is ſaid to be for the Honour of St. *Peter*; but ſince you paſs it over, on this occaſion, I hope you are convinced of the Forgery of it.

In the beginning of your next *Chapter* (which becauſe of the Coherence of the matter I handle with this) you find great Fault with his *Lordſhip for a Marginal Citation out of* Gerſon, *becauſe he ſuppoſeth that* Gerſon's *Judgment was, that the Church might continue without a Monarchical Head, becauſe he writ a Tract* de Auferibilitate Papæ; *whereas*, you ſay, Gerſon's *drift is only to ſhew how many ſeveral ways the Pope may be taken away, that is, deprived of his Office, and ceaſe to be Pope as to his own Perſon, ſo that the Church*, pro tempore, *till another be choſen ſhall be without her viſible Head.* But although the Truth of what his Lordſhip proves, doth not at all depend upon this Teſtimony of *Gerſon*, which was only a *Marginal Citation*; yet ſince you ſo boldly accuſe him for a *falſe Allegation*, we muſt further examine how pertinent this Teſtimony is to that which his Lordſhip brought it for. The Sentence to which this Citation of *Gerſon* refers, is this. *For they are no mean ones, who think our Saviour Chriſt left the Church-militant in the hands of the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, in an Ariſtocratical, or rather a mixt Government; and that the Church is not Monarchical, otherwiſe than the Triumphant and Militant make one Body under Chriſt the Head.* Over-againſt theſe Words, that Tract of *Gerſon de Auferibilitate Papæ* is cited. If therefore ſo much be contained in that Book, as makes good this, which his Lordſhip ſays; he is not ſo much guilty of falſe alledging *Gerſon*, as you are of falſly accuſing him. To make this clear, we muſt conſider what *Gerſon*'s deſign was in writing that Book, and what his Opinion therein is concerning the *Church's Government.* It is well known, that his Book was written upon the occaſion of the *Council* of *Conſtance* in the time of the great *Schiſm* between the three Popes; and that the deſign of it, is, to make it appear that it was in the Power of the *Council* to depoſe the Popes, and ſuſpend them from all *Juriſdiction* in the *Church.* Therefore, he ſaith, *That the Pope may not only loſe his Office by voluntary Ceſſion; but that in many caſes he may be deprived by the Church, or by a General Council repreſenting the Church, whether he conſent to it or no:* Nay, in the next Conſideration, he ſaith, *That he may be deprived by a General Council which is celebrated without his Conſent or againſt his Will*; And, in the following Conſideration adds, *That this may be done not only declaratively, but juridically*; the Queſtion now comes to this, Whether a Perſon who aſſerts theſe things, doth believe the *Government* of the *Militant Church* to be *Monarchical*, and not rather *Ariſtocratical* and *mixt Government*? And I dare appeal to any Mans Reaſon, whether that may be accounted a *Monarchical Government*, where he that is *Supreme* may be de-

§. 12. P. 221.

P. 200.

Gerſon de Auferibilitate Papæ Conſider. 10.

poſed and deprived of his Office in a *Juridical manner*, by a *Senate* that hath Authority to do theſe things? For it is apparent, the *Supreme Power* lies in the *Senate* and not the *Prince*, and that the *Prince* is only a *Miniſterial Head* under them. And this is plainly *Gerſon*'s Opinion as to the *Church*; although therefore he may allow the ſupreme *Miniſterial Authority* to be in the Pope, (which is all your Citations prove) yet the *radical* and intrinſecal *Power* lies in the *Church*, which being repreſented in a *General Council*, may *depoſe* the Pope from his *Authority* in the *Church*. And the truth is, this Opinion of *Gerſon* makes the Fundamental Power of the Church to be *Democratical*, and that the *Supreme Exerciſe* is by *Repreſentatives* in a *General Council*, and that the *Pope* at the higheſt, is but a *Miniſterial* and *accountable Head*. And therefore *Spalatenſis* truly obſerves, *That this Opinion of* Gerſon (which is the ſame with that of the *Paris Divines*, of which he ſpeaks) *doth only in Words attribute ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction to the Pope, but in reality it takes it quite away from him.* And this is the ſame *Doctrine* which then prevailed in the *Council of Conſtance*, and afterwards at *Baſil*, as may be ſeen at large in their *Synodical Epiſtle*, defended by *Richerius*, *Vigorius*, and others. Now let any Man of Reaſon judge, whether, notwithſtanding your charge of *falſe Citation*, (from ſome Expreſſions intimating only a *Miniſterial Headſhip*) his Lordſhip did not very pertinently cite this Tract of *Gerſon*'s, to prove *that no mean Perſons did think the Church Militant, not to be Governed by a Monarchical, but by an Ariſtocratical or mixt Government*?

Spalat. de Rep. Eccleſ. Tom. 1. l. 4. c. 7. ſect. 5.

§. 13. P. 212. But no ſooner is this marginal Citation cleared, but the Charge is renewed about another, *viz.* St. *Hierom*; yet here you dare not charge his Lordſhip with a falſe Allegation, but you are put to your ſhifts to get off this Teſtimony as well as you can. For, St. *Hierom* ſaying expreſly in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, *Ubicunque fuerit Epiſcopus, ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubii, ſive Conſtantinopoli, ſive Rhegii, &c. ejuſdem meriti eſt, ejuſdem eſt & ſacerdotii*; his Lordſhip might well infer, *That doubtleſs he thought not of the Roman Biſhops Monarchy. For what Biſhop*, ſaith he, *is of the ſame Merit or the ſame degree in the Prieſthood with the Pope, as things are now carried at* Rome? To this you Anſwer, *That he ſpeaks not of the Pope, as he is Pope, or in reſpect of that eminent Authority, which belongs to him as St.* Peter's *Succeſſor, but only compares him with another private Biſhop, in reſpect of meer Character or Power of a Biſhop, as Biſhop only.* But though this be all which any of your Party ever ſince the *Reformation* have been able to Anſwer to this place; yet nothing looks more like a meer *ſhift* than this doth. For had St. *Hierom* only compared theſe *Biſhops* together in regard of their *Order*, was not *Sacerdotium* enough to expreſs that by? if St. *Hierom* had ſaid only, that all Biſhops are *ejuſdem ſacerdotii*, there might have been ſome plauſible Pretence for this Diſtinction; but when he adds *ejuſdem meriti* too, he wholly precludes the Poſſibility of your evading that way. For, What doth *Merit* here ſtand for as diſtinct from Prieſthood, if it imports not ſomething beſides what belongs to *Biſhops as Biſhops*? What can *Merit* here ſignifie, but ſome greater *Power*, *Authority*, and *Juriſdiction* given by *Chriſt* to one *Biſhop* above another? S. *Hierom* was not ſo ſenſleſs, as not to ſee that the *Biſhops of Rome, Conſtantinople, and Alexandria*, had greater *Authority*, and larger *Juriſdiction* in the *Church*, than the petty *Biſhops* of *Eugubium*, *Rhegium*, and *Tanis*; but all this he knew well enough came by the Cuſtom of the *Church*, that one *Biſhop* ſhould have larger Power in the *Church* than another. But (ſaith he) if you come to urge us with what ought to be practiſed in the *Church*, then, ſaith he, *Orbis major*

eſt

eſt Urbe, it is no one City, as that of *Rome* (which he particularly inſtanceth in) which can preſcribe to the whole World; For (ſaith he) *all Biſhops are of equal Merit, and the ſame Prieſthood, whereſoever they are, whether at* Rome *or elſewhere.* So that it is plain to all, but ſuch as wilfully blind themſelves, that St. *Hierom* ſpeaks not of that, which you call, *The Character of Biſhops*, but of the *Authority* of them; for that very Word he uſeth immediately before, *Si authoritas quæritur, orbis major eſt urbe.* And where do you ever find *Merit* applyed to the *Biſhop's Character*? They who ſay, It is underſtood of the *Merit of good Life*, make St. *Hierom* ſpeak Non-ſenſe. For are all *Biſhops* of the *ſame Merit of good Life*? But we need not go out of *Rome* for the proper Importance of *Merit* here. For in the *third Roman Synod under* Symmachus, that very Word is uſed concerning Authority and Principality in the Church; *ejus ſedi primum Petri Apoſtoli meritum ſive principatus, deinde Conciliorum venerandorum Authoritas*, &c. where *Binius* confeſſeth an Account is given of the *Supremacy* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, the firſt ground of which is *S. Peter's Merit or Principality*; apply now but this Senſe to S. *Hierom*, and he may be very eaſily underſtood, All *Biſhops* are *ejuſdem meriti ſive Principatus, of the ſame Merit, Dignity or Authority in the Church.* But you ſay, *he ſpeaks not of the Pope, as he is Pope:* good Reaſon for it, for St. *Hierom* knew no ſuch *Supremacy* in the *Pope*, as he now challengeth. And can you think, if St. *Hierom* had believed ſuch an Authority in the *Pope* as you do, he would ever have uſed ſuch Words as theſe are, to compare him with the poor *Biſhop* of *Agobio* in *Merit* and *Prieſthood*? I cannot perſwade my ſelf you can think ſo, only ſomething muſt be ſaid for the Cauſe you have undertaken to defend. And ſince *Bellarmine*, and ſuch great Men, had gone before you, you could not believe there were any Abſurdity in ſaying as they did. Still you ſay, *He doth not ſpeak of that Authority which belongs to the Biſhop of* Rome, *as Saint* Peter's *Succeſſor.* But if you would but read a little further, you might ſee that S. *Hierom* ſpeaks of all *Biſhops*, whether at *Rome*, or *Eugubium*, &c. as equally the *Apoſtles Succeſſors: For it is neither* (ſaith he) *Riches or Poverty which makes Biſhops higher or lower. Cæterùm omnes Apoſtolorum ſucceſſores ſunt*; but they are all the Apoſtles Succeſſors; therefore he ſpeaks of them with relation to that *Authority* which they derived from the *Apoſtles.* And never had there been greater Neceſſity for him to ſpeak of the *Popes ſucceeding S. Peter* in the *Supremacy* over the *Church* than here, if he had known any ſuch thing, but he muſt be excuſed, he was ignorant of it. *No, that he could not be* (ſay you again) *for he ſpeaks of it elſewhere, and therefore he muſt be ſo underſtood there, as that he neither contradict nor condemn himſelf.* But if the Epiſtle to *Damaſus* be all your Evidence for it, a ſufficient Account hath been given of that already; *therefore you add more*, and bid us go find them out, to ſee, Whether they make for the Purpoſe or no. I am ſure your *firſt* doth not out of his *Commentary* on the 13 *Pſalm*, becauſe it only ſpeaks of S. *Peter's being Head of the Church*, and not of the *Pope's*, and that may import only *Dignity* and *Preheminence*, without Authority and Juriſdiction: Beſides, that *Commentary* on the *Pſalms* is rejected as ſpurious by *Eraſmus*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, and many others among your ſelves. Your ſecond, *ad Demetriadem Virginem*, is much leſs to your Purpoſe; for that only ſpeaks of *Innocentius* coming after *Anaſtaſius* at *Rome. qui Apoſtolicæ Cathedræ & ſupradicti viri ſucceſſor & filius eſt, Who ſucceeded him in the Apoſtolical Chair:* But, Do you not know that there were many *Apoſtolical Chairs* beſides that of *Rome*, and had every one of them ſupreme Authority over the Church of God? What that ſhould be on the

Concil. Rom. 3 ſub Symmacho To. 3. p. 688.

16 of S. *Matthew*, I cannot imagine, unleſs it be that S. *Peter* is called *Princeps Apoſtolorum*, which Honour we deny him not, or that he ſaith *Ædificabo Eccleſiam meam ſuper te*: But how theſe Things concern the *Pope's Authority*, unleſs you had further enlightned us, I cannot underſtand. That *ep.* 54 *ad Marcellam*, is of the ſame Nature with the laſt, for the Words which I ſuppoſe you mean, are, *Petrus ſuper quem Dominus fundavit Eccleſiam*; and if you ſee, what *Eraſmus* ſaith upon that Place, you will have little Cauſe to boaſt much of it. Your laſt Place is, *l.* 1. *Cont. Lucifer.* which I ſuppoſe to be that commonly cited thence; *Eccleſiæ ſalus in ſummi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet*; but there even *Marianus Victorius* will tell you, it is underſtood of every *ordinary Biſhop*. Thus I have taken the Pains to ſearch thoſe Places you nakedly refer us to in S. *Hierom*, and find him far enough from the leaſt Danger of contradicting or condemning himſelf, as to any thing which is here ſpoken by him. So that we ſee S. *Hierom* remains a ſufficient Teſtimony againſt the *Pope's Monarchical Government* of the *Church*.

§. 14. P. 201. *Optat. l.* 3. His Lordſhip further argues againſt this *Monarchy* in the *Church from the great and undoubted Rule given by* Optatus; *that whereſoever there is a Church, there the Church is in the Common-wealth, and not the Common-wealth in the Church. And ſo alſo the Church was in the Roman Empire. Now from this ground* (ſaith his Lordſhip) *I argue thus. If the Church be within the Empire, or other Kingdom, 'tis impoſſible the Government of the Church ſhould be Monarchical. For no Emperour or King will endure another King within his Dominion, that ſhall be greater than himſelf, ſince the very enduring* P. 223. *it makes him that endures it upon the Matter no Monarch.* Your Anſwer to this, is, *That theſe two Kingdoms are of different Natures, the one Spiritual, the other Temporal: the one exerciſed only in ſuch Things as concern the Worſhip of God, and the Eternal Salvation of Souls; the other in Affairs that concern this World only.* Surely you would perſwade us, we had never heard of, much leſs read *Bellarmine*'s *Fifth Book de Pontifice*, about the *Pope's Temporal Power*, which was fain to get Licence for the other *Four* to paſs at *Rome*; and although he minces the Matter as much as may be, and much more than *Baronius* and others did, who pleaded downright for the *Pope's Temporal Power*; yet he muſt be a very weak *Prince*, who doth not ſee how far that *indirect* and *reductive Power*, may extend, when the Pope himſelf is to be *Judge*, What comes under it, and what not. And, What may not come under it, when *depoſing* of *Princes* ſhall be reduced under that you call *the Worſhip of God*? And *abſolving Subjects to their Obedience*, tend to promote their *Eternal Salvation*? But if the *Pope* may be *Judge*, What *temporal things* are *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, and bring them under his Power in that Reſpect, Why may not the *Prince* be *Judge* what *ſpiritual things* are *in ordine ad temporalia*, and uſe his *Power* over them in that Reſpect too? But in the mean time, Is not a *Kingdom* like to be at Peace then? If the Pope challenged no other Authority but *what Chriſt or the Apoſtle had*, his Government might be admitted, as well as that Authority which they had; but, What do you think of us the mean while, when you would perſwade us, that the *Pope's Power* is no other than what *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles* had? You muſt certainly think us ſuch Perſons *as the Moon hath wrought particularly upon*, as you after very civilly ſpeak concerning his Lordſhip. Your Inſtance *from the Kings of* France *and* Spain, his Lordſhip had ſufficiently anſwered, by telling you, *That he that is not blind may ſee if he will, of what little value the Pope's Power is in thoſe Kingdoms, further than to ſerve their own turns of him, which they do to their great Advantage.* And when you would

would have this to be *upon the account of Faith and Conscience*, let the Pope exercise his Power apparently against their *Interest*, and then see, on what account they profess Obedience to him. But, as long as they can manage such Pretences for their Advantage, and admit so much of it, and no more, they may very well endure it, and his Lordship be far enough from contradicting himself. When you would urge the same Inconvenience against the *Aristocratical Government* of the *Church*, you suppose that *Aristocratical Government* wholly *Independent* on, and not subordinate to, the *Civil Government*; whereas his Lordship and the *Church of England* assert the *King's Supremacy in Government over all, both Persons and Causes Ecclesiastical:* And therefore this nothing concerns us. And if from what hath gone before, *it must*, as you say, *remain therefore fully proved, that the external Government of the Church on Earth is Monarchical*; It may for all that I see, remain as fully proved, that you are now the Man who enjoy this *Monarchical Power* over the *Church*. And whatever you stile the Pope, Whether *the Deputy*, or *Vicar General of Christ*, or *Servus servorum*, or what you will; it is all one to us as long as we know his meaning, whatever fair Words you give him. As though Men would take it one Jot the better to have one usurp and *Tyrannize* over them, because he doth not call himself *King* or *Prince*, but *their humble Servant*. Is it not by so much the greater *Tyranny?* to have such kind of *Ecclesiastical Saturnalia*, when the *servus servorum* must, under that Name, *tyrannize* over the whole World? P. 224.

We have already at large shewed, How destructive this pretended Supremacy is to that Government of the Church by *Bishops*, which, his Lordship proves *from the ancient Canons and Fathers of the Church, doth of right belong to them*, viz. *from several Canons of the Councils of* Antioch *and* Nice, *and the Testimonies of S.* Augustine *and S.* Cyprian. To all this you only say, *That you allow the Bishops their Portion in the Government of Christ's Flock:* But it is but a very small Portion of what belongs to them, if all their *Jurisdiction* must be derived from the Pope; which I have shewed before to be the most current Opinion in your Church: And I dare say, you will not dispute the contrary. His Lordship was well enough aware, to what purpose *Bellarmine* acknowledged that the *Government of the Church* was ever in the *Bishops*; for he himself saith, *It was to exclude temporral Princes; but then he desires* A. C. *to take notice of that, when Secular Princes are to be excluded, then it shall be pretended, that Bishops have Power to govern; but when it comes to sharing Stakes between them and the Pope, then Hands off*; they have nothing to do any further than the Pope gives them leave. What follows concerning the Impossibility of a Right executing of this *Monarchy* in the *Church* hath been already discoursed of, and you answer nothing at all to it that hath any Face of Pertinency; for when you say, it will hold as well against the *Aristocratical Form*, I have plainly enough shewed you the contrary. P. 202. P. 224.

That which follows about the Design of an *Universal Monarchy* in the *State*, as well as the *Church*; about Pope *Innocent*'s *making the Pope to be the Sun, and the Emperor the Moon, the Spanish Friers two Scutchions*, Campanella's *Eclogue*, since you will not stand to defend them, I shall willingly pass them over. But what concerns the *Supremacy* of the Civil Power, is more to our purpose, and must be considered. His Lordship therefore saith, *That every Soul was to be subject to the higher Power*, Rom. 13. 1. *And the higher Power there mentioned, is the Temporal. And the ancient Fathers come in with a full Consent, that every Soul comprehends all without Exception: All spiritual Men, even to the highest Bishop, even in spiritual Causes too, so* P. 15. P. 225, 227. P. 205.

the

the Foundations of Faith and good Manners be not ſhaken: And where they are ſhaken, there ought to be Prayer and Patience, there ought not to be Oppoſition by Force. Nay, Emperors and Kings are cuſtodes utriuſque Tabulæ; *They to whom the Cuſtody and Preſervation of both Tables of the Law, for Worſhip to God, and Duty to Man, are committed. A Book of the Law was by God's own Command in* Moſes *his time, to be given to the King,* Deut. 17. 18. *And the Kings under the Law, but ſtill according to it, did proceed to neceſſary Reformation in Church Buſineſſes; and therein commanded the very Prieſts themſelves, as appears in the Acts of* Hezekiah *and* Joſiah, *who yet were never cenſured to this Day for uſurping the High-Prieſt's Office. Nay, and the greateſt Emperors for the Churches Honour,* Theodoſius *the elder, and* Juſtinian, *and* Charles *the Great, and divers others, did not only meddle now and then, but enact Laws to the great Settlement and encreaſe of Religion in their ſeveral times.* Now to this again you anſwer, *That the Civil and Spiritual are both abſolute and independent Powers, though each in their proper Orb, the one in Spirituals, the other in Temporals.* But, What is this to that which his Lordſhip proves, *That there can be no ſuch abſolute independent ſpiritual Power; both becauſe all are bound to obey the Civil Power, and becauſe the Civil Power hath a right to meddle in Eccleſiaſtical Matters?* And, though you expreſs never ſo much Honour to civil Authority, yet ſtill you limit it *to the Adminiſtration meerly of civil Affairs:* and how far that is, is well enough known. You tell us plainly, *That it doth not belong to the Emperor to order the Affairs of the Church;* But why do you not anſwer the Reaſons and Inſtances which his Lordſhip brings to the contrary? Yet you yield, *That in caſe of notorious and groſs Abuſes, manifeſtly contrary to Religion, and connived at by the Paſtors of the Church, Chriſtian Princes may lawfully and piouſly uſe their Authority, in procuring the ſaid Abuſes to be effectually redreſſed by the ſaid Paſtors,,* *as the Examples of* Ezekias *and* Joſias *prove.* But in caſe the *High-Prieſt* would not have yielded to ſuch a Reformation, Might not thoſe *Princes*, by the aſſiſtance of other *Prieſts*, have effected it? This is the caſe you were to ſpeak to: For whereas you fly out, and ſay, *That Princes may not take the Prieſt's Office upon them;* Whom do you diſpute againſt in that? Not his Lorſhip certainly, nor any of the *Church* of *England*, who never ſaid they might, though they have been moſt injuriouſly calumniated, as though they did. That which we aſſert, is, That *Princes* may enact *Laws* concerning Religion, and reform Abuſes in *Divine Worſhip*, but we do not ſay, they may take the *Paſtoral Office* upon them; and therefore you ſay no more in that than we do our ſelves. But when you ſay, *They may not reform Religion in the Subſtance of it*, I cannot well tell how to underſtand you. If you mean, not ſo reform Religion, as to take away any of the *Subſtance*, that is a Reformation to purpoſe; but if you bring it *ad hypotheſin*, we utterly deny that any of the Subſtance of Religion was taken away upon our *Church's* Reformation: If you mean, not reform Abuſes, which go under the Name of the *Subſtance* of *Religion*, that will be to make the moſt unſufferable Abuſes the moſt incurable. But, when you add, *That nothing may be enacted pertaining to Religion by their own Authority without, or contrary to the Prieſt's Conſent* (the *High-Prieſt*, I ſuppoſe you mean) ſhew us, Where the *Kings* of *Iſrael* were bound, not to reform in caſe the *High-Prieſt* did not conſent; and if you could do this, you muſt prove ſuch a *High-Prieſt* now, and that *Princes* are bound to wait his Leiſure for reforming Abuſes in *Religion*, when his pretended *Authority* is upheld by maintaining them. As for your Commendations of Pope *Hildebrand*, and *Innocent the third, for very prudent Men, and worthy*

P. 226.

Champions

Champions of your Church, we see, What *Prudence* is with you, and what a worthy *Church* you have. But it is still an excellent Evasion, *That they never endeavoured to subject the Emperor to themselves in temporal Matters*; no nor *Alexander* the Third neither, when he trod upon the *Emperor's* Neck? But the Proceedings of these Popes with the *Emperors*, as likewise *Adrian* 4. *Lucius* 3. and others, are so gross, that it had been more for your Interest with Christian *Princes*, to disown them, than to go about to palliate them with such frivolous Distinctions, that his *Understanding* must be as *blind* as his *Obedience*, that doth not see thorough them. You are much concerned, that his Lordship should seem to give a Lash to those mortified self-denying Men, *the Jesuits, in bidding them leave their practising to advance the greatness of the Pope and Emperor; for, Who could believe they should deprive themselves of the Riches and Pleasures of the World upon such Designs?* Undoubtedly you are one of the Number, for I never heard that any other *Order* among you, did ever give them half so good Words, but condemned them as much for their practising, as we do our selves. And, What *holy Men* they are, and what excellent Casuistical Divinity about both the Riches and Pleasures of the World, if we did not otherwise know, the *Mysteries* of *Jesuitism* would sufficiently discover To what his Lordship saith further, *That there is no necessity of one Supreme Living Judge, to keep the Church in Peace and Unity, but that the several Bishops under their Sovereign Princes, are sufficient in order to it*; you only say, *That he quotes* Occham *for it.* But, Doth he nothing else but quote *Occham*? Why do you not answer to the thing, and not barely to *Occham*? You have very good reason for it; for you have little to say to the thing it self; but for *Occham*, you have enough to tell him in his Ear. 1. *That he is in the Index of forbidden Books*; a good Testimony for the Man's Honesty. 2. *That he sided with the Emperor*; a Crime beyond an *Index Expurgatorius* at *Rome*. 3. *That if there were such a Government as* Occham *supposes, all those Governours must be Infallible, or else there would be meer Anarchy in the Church*: And, Why not as well in the *State*, without *Infallibility* there? You say, *For want of this Infallibility, those Countries where it is not acknowledged, are in Schisms*: And we say, The pretence of this *Infallibility* hath caused the greatest of them. 4. You say, *Occham speaks only* de possibili, *of what might have been, if our Saviour had pleased*; but *Occham* says, There is no necessity there should be one chief Governour under Christ, and we say, You can never prove that Christ hath appointed that there shall be one; and therefore this is more than disputing a bare Possibility.

P. 227.

P. 228.

But now, as though all your beggings the Question had been Arguments, all your Sayings Proofs, and all your Proofs Demonstrations, with as much Authority as if you were *in Cathedrâ*, you conclude; *Remain it therefore a settled Catholick Principle, that the Pope hath Power over the whole Church of God*; But you leave out something which should be at the end of it, *among all those who can believe things as strongly without Reason, as with it.* And for the greater Solemnity of the Sentence you give it in the Words of the *Oecumenical Council* at *Florence*: And I must needs say, You have fitted them very well, for that was just as much an *Oecumenical Council*, as the *Pope* is *Oecumenical Pastor*: but, that neither the one nor the other is so, I have sufficiently proved already.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Council of *Trent.*

The Illegality of it manifeſted, firſt from the Inſufficiency of the Rule it proceeded by, different from that of the firſt General Councils, and from the Pope's Preſidency in it. The matter of Right concerning it, diſcuſſed. In what Caſes Superiors may be excepted againſt as Parties. The Pope juſtly excepted againſt as a Party, and therefore ought not to be Judge. The Neceſſity of a Reformation in the Court of Rome, *acknowledged by Roman Catholicks. The matter of Fact enquired into, as to the Pope's Preſidency in General Councils.* Hoſius *did not preſide in the Nicene Council as the Pope's Legat. The Pope had nothing to do in the ſecond General Council. Two Councils held at* Conſtantinople, *within two Years; theſe ſtrangely confounded. The miſtake made evident. S.* Cyril *not Preſident in the third General Council as the Pope's Legate. No ſufficient evidence of the Pope's Preſidency in following Councils. The juſtneſs of the Exception againſt the place, manifeſted; and againſt the freedom of the Council from the Oath taken by the Biſhops to the Pope. The form of that Oath in the time of the Council of* Trent. *Proteſtants not condemned by General Councils. The Greeks and others unjuſtly excluded as Schiſmaticks. The Exception from the ſmall Number of Biſhops cleared and vindicated. A General Council in Antiquity not ſo called from the Pope's General Summons. In what ſenſe a General Council repreſents the whole Church. The vaſt difference between the Proceedings in the Council of* Nice, *and that at* Trent. *The Exception from the Number of Italian Biſhops, juſtified. How far the Greek Church and the Patriarch* Hieremias *may be ſaid to condemn Proteſtants; with an account of the Proceedings between them.*

§. 1. HAving thus far conſidered the ſeveral Grounds on which you lay the Charge of *Schiſm* upon us, and ſhewed at large the Weakneſs and Inſufficiency of them, we ſhould now have proceeded to the laſt part of our Task, but that the great *Palladium* of the preſent *Roman Church*, viz. the *Council* of *Trent*, muſt be examined, to ſee whether it be ἀγιοπνεύς, or no; whether it came from *Heaven*, or was only the Contrivance of ſome cunning Artificers. And the famous *Biſhop* of *Bitonto* in the Sermon made at the opening the *Council* of *Trent*, hath given us ſome ground to conjecture its Original by his comparing it ſo ominouſly to the *Trojan-Horſe*. Although therefore that the Pretences may be high and great, that it was made *Divina Palladis arte*, the *Spirit of God* being ſaid to be preſent in it, and concurring with it, yet they who ſearch further will find as much of *Artifice* in contriving, and Deceit in the managing the one as the other. And although the *Cardinal Palavicino* uſes all his Art, to bring this Similitude off, without reflecting on the Honour of the *Council*; yet that *Biſhop*, who in that *Sermon* pleaded ſo much, *That the Spirit of God would open the Mouths of the Council, as he did once thoſe of* Balaam *and* Caiaphas, was himſelf in this Expreſſion an illuſtrious Inſtance of the truth of what he ſaid. For he ſpake as true in this, as if he had been *High-Prieſt himſelf that Year.* But, as if you really believed your ſelf the truth of that *Biſhop's* Doctrine, *That whatever Spirit was within them, yet being met in Council, the Spirit of God would infallibly inſpire them*, you ſet your ſelf to a ſerious Vindication of the Proceedings of that *Council*; and not only ſo, but triumph in it, as

Hiſt. Council of *Trent. l.* 1. *p.* 132.

that

that which will bring *the Cauſe to a ſpeedy Iſſue.* And therefore we muſt particularly enquire into all the Pretences you bring to juſtifie the lawfulneſs and freedom of that *Council:* but, to keep to the *Biſhop's Metaphor*,

Accipe nunc Danaum Inſidias; & crimine ab uno
Diſce omnes.

And when we have thorowly ſearched this great *Engine* of your *Church*, we ſhall have little reaſon to believe, *that ever it fell from Heaven.* His Lordſhip then having ſpoken *of the Uſefulneſs of free General Councils, for making ſome Laws which concern the whole Church*; His Adverſary thinks preſently to give him a *Choak-Pear*, by telling him, *That the Council of* Trent *was a General Council; and that had already judged the Proteſtants to hold Errors.* This you call, *The Laying the Axe to the Root of the Tree*; that *Tree*, you mean, out of which the Pope's Infallible *Chair* was cut: for the Management of this diſpute about the *Council* of *Trent*, will redound very little to the honour of your *Church* or Cauſe. But you do well to add, *That his Lordſhip was not taken unprovided:* for he truly anſwered, *That the Council of* Trent *was neither a Legal, nor a General Council.* Both theſe we undertake to make good, in Oppoſition to what you bring by way of Anſwer to his Lordſhip's Exceptions to them. P. 229. P. 213.

That which we begin with, is, That it was not a *Legal Council*, which his Lordſhip proves: Firſt, *Becauſe that Council maintained publickly, that it is lawful for them to conclude any Controverſie, and make it to be* de Fide, *and ſo in your Judgment Fundamental, though it have not a written Word for its warrant; nay, ſo much as a probable Teſtimony from Scripture.* The force of his Lordſhip's Argument I ſuppoſe lies in this, that the Decrees of that *Council* cannot be ſuch as ſhould bind us to an aſſent to them; becauſe according to their own Principles, thoſe Decrees may have no Foundation in *Scripture:* And that the only legal proceeding in *General Councils*, is, to decree according to the *Scriptures.* Now to this you anſwer, *That the meaning of the Council, or Catholick Authors, is not, that the Council may make whatever they pleaſe matter of Faith, but only that which is expreſſed or involved in the Word of God written or unwritten*; and this you confeſs, *is defined by the Council of* Trent, *in theſe terms, that in matters of Faith we are to rely not only upon Scripture, but alſo on Tradition: which Doctrine* (you ſay) *is true, and that you have already proved it:* And I may as well ſay, It is falſe, for I have already anſwered all your pretended Proofs. But it is one thing, Whether the Doctrine be *true* or no; and another, Whether the *Council* did proceed *legally* in defining things upon this Principle. For upon your Grounds you are bound to believe it true, becauſe the *Council* hath defined it to be ſo: But if you will undertake to juſtifie the Proceedings of the *Council* as *legal*, you muſt make it appear that this was the Rule which *General Councils* have always acted by, in defining any thing to be matter of Faith. But if this appear to be falſe; and that you cannot inſtance in any true *General Council*, which did look on this as a ſufficient ground to proceed upon, then though the thing may, ſince that Decree, be believed as *true*, yet that *Council* did not proceed *legally* in defining upon ſuch Grounds. Name us therefore, what *Council* did ever offer to determine a *matter* of *Faith* meerly upon *Tradition?* In the four firſt *General Councils* it is well known, what Authority was given to the *Scripture* in their Definitions: and I hope you will not ſay, That any thing they defined, had no other ground but *Tradition.* But ſuppoſe you could prove this, it is not enough for your purpoſe, unleſs you can make it appear, that §. 2. P. 230.

thoſe *Fathers* in making ſuch Decrees, did acknowledge they had no ground in *Scripture* for them. For if you ſhould prove that *really* there was no Foundation but *Tradition*, yet all that you can infer thence, is, That thoſe *Fathers* were deceived in judging they had other Grounds, when they had not. But ſtill, if they made *Scripture* their *Rule*, and looked on nothing elſe as a *Foundation* for their Definitions, but the *written Word* of *God*, then the *Council* of *Trent* did not proceed *legally*, in offering to define matters of *Faith*, on ſuch Grounds which were not acknowledged by the *Primitive Church*, to be ſufficient Foundation for ſuch Definitions. *Cardinal Cuſanus* at large gives an account of the Method of Proceeding in the *Ancient General Councils*, and therein tells us, not only *that the Word of God was placed in the middle among thoſe who ſate in Council*, but gives this as the only Rule of their Proceeding, *quòd ſecundum teſtimonia Scripturarum decrevit Synodus*; that they decreed according to the Teſtimonies of Scripture. Now if another *Council* ſhall go according to a different *Rule* from what the *Church* hath eſteemed the only *true* and *adæquate Foundation* for Definition of *Faith*, that *Council* breaks the inviolable *Laws* of *Councils*, and therefore its Proceedings cannot be *legal*. As for Inſtance; Suppoſing a *Parliament* not to have Power to make new *Laws*, but to declare only what is *Law*, and what not (for that is all you pretend to, as to *General Councils*) and that all other former *Parliaments* have all along profeſſed this to be their Rule, *viz. that they ſearch into the Body of the Laws*; and if any thing be controverted, Whether it be a *Law* or no, they make a diligent ſearch into it, and examine all Circumſtances concerning it, for their own Satisfaction, and according to the Evidence they find of its being contained in this Body of *Laws*, they declare themſelves: but many things growing much in *uſe* among a *prevailing Party*, which have no Colour of being in the *written Laws*, but yet tend much to the *Intereſt* of that *Party*; and theſe being oppoſed by ſuch, who ſtand up for the ancient and known *Laws*, the other are forced to make uſe of as good an Expedient as they can, to preſerve their Intereſt and Credit together. To which end they pack together a Company of ſuch, who are moſt concerned to maintain the things in *Queſtion*, and among theſe, the great *Innovator* ſits as *Preſident* among them, and ſuffers none to come there, but ſuch as are obliged by *Oath* to ſpeak nothing againſt his *Intereſt*; and theſe, when met together, ſeeing how unable they are to manage their Buſineſs according to former *Precedents*; the firſt thing they do, is to declare, *That Cuſtoms and uſages have as much the force of Laws among them, as any contained in the Body of them*; and having eſtabliſhed this their *Rule*, according to it they decree all the matters in difference, to be true and real *Laws*. Would any Man ſay, That theſe Men proceeded *legally*, who firſt make the *Foundation* they are to go on, contrary to all former *Precedents*, and then define according to that? Yet this, in all Particulars, is exactly the caſe of the *Council* of *Trent*; but the laſt part is that we are now about; that they ſhould, contrary to the Proceedings of all *General Councils* in matters of *Faith*, firſt make their *Rule*, and then bind all Men to all thoſe *Decrees* which are made according to it. And therefore, though the *Council* of *Trent* may be thought to act *wiſely* in advancing *Traditions* to an equality with *Scripture* in the firſt place, yet he muſt have a great deal of Confidence, and little Judgment, who ſays, that in decreeing Matters of Faith from Tradition, is acted *legally*; *i. e.* according to the Rules of the undoubted *General Councils*. I cannot therefore ſay, whether you have more of the one, or leſs of the other, when you tell us without offering to

Cuſanus de Concord. Cath. l. 2. c. 6.

prove

prove it, *That the Council did not proceed in a different manner, from other lawful General Councils, whilſt ſhe grounded her Definitions, partly on Scripture, partly on Tradition, even in Matters not deducible by any particular or Logical Inference from Scripture.* The Abſurdity of which Doctrine in it ſelf, I have at large diſcovered already in our Diſcourſe of the *Reſolution of Faith*, where it is ſhewed in what Senſe his Lordſhip ſays, *That Apoſtolical Tradition is the Word of God*; But that this was a *legal Way* of proceeding in the *Council* of *Trent*, to define Matters of Faith by ſuch *Traditions* as have no Ground in *Scripture*, had need be better proved, than by your bare Affirmation. And if that be a *Tradition* too, I am ſure it is one that is neither contained in, nor deducible from, the *Scripture.*

2. His Lordſhip juſtly excepts againſt the *Council* of *Trent*, *from the Pope's ſitting as Preſident in it. For*, ſaith he, *Is that Council legal, where the Pope the chief Perſon to be reformed ſhall ſit Preſident in it, and be chief Judge in his own cauſe againſt all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane?* To this you return an Anſwer, both to the *matter* of *Right*, and the *matter of Fact.* To the *matter of Right*, you ſay, *That the Pope not being juſtly accuſable of any Crime, but ſuch as muſt involve, not only the Council; but the whole Church as well as himſelf, the Proteſtants had no juſt cauſe to quarrel with the Pope's preſiding in it. Nay, that it is conformable to all Law, Divine, Natural, and Humane, that the Head ſhould preſide over the Members; and to give Novelliſts Liberty to decline the Pope's Judgment, or the Judgment of any other their lawful Superiors upon pretence of their being Parties, is in effect to exempt abſolutely ſuch People from all legal Cenſure; and to grant there is no ſufficient means effectually to govern the Church, or condemn Hereſie, Schiſm, and other Offences againſt Religion.* But is it not unanſwerable on the other ſide, that this *Plea* of yours makes it impoſſible, that the *Errors* and *Corruptions* of a *Church* ſhould be reformed, in caſe the *Governors* of the *Church* do abett and maintain them? If you ſay, *That it is not poſſible the Governors of the Church ſhould do ſo*, we have nothing but your bare Word for it, and Reaſon and Experience manifeſt the contrary. In caſe then there be a vehement Preſumption at leaſt, in a conſiderable Party of the *Church*, that the *Church* is much degenerated and needs Reformation, but thoſe who call themſelves the lawful *Superiors* of the *Church* utterly oppoſe it; What is to be done in this caſe? Muſt the *Church* continue as it did, meerly becauſe the *Superiors* make themſelves *Parties*? Nay, ſuppoſe that which you would call *Idolatry* be in the *Church*, and the Pope and a *Council* of his *packing* declare for it; muſt there be no Endeavours of a *Reformation*, but by them who pronounce all *Hereticks* who oppoſe them? But you ſay, *The Head muſt preſide over the Members:* an excellent Argument to defend all Uſurpations both in *Church* and *State!* for doubtleſs, they who are in Power will call themſelves the *Heads* of all others, if that will ſecure them from any Danger. *But this will exempt them from all legal Cenſure:* ſo will your Principles, all *Governors* of the *Church* though guilty of *Hereſie*, *Blaſphemy*, *Idolatry*, or what Crime ſoever. For ſtill, I hope, *the Head muſt be over the Members*; and you ſay, *it will bring the Church to Confuſion, if any ſhall except againſt their Superiors as Parties.* You muſt therefore abſolutely and roundly aſſert, that it is impoſſible that the *Superiors* in the *Church* may be guilty of any Error or Corruption; or that, if they be, they muſt never be called to an account for it; or elſe that it may be juſt in ſome *Caſes* to except againſt them as *Parties.* And if in *ſome Caſes*, then the Queſtion comes to this, whether the preſent be *ſome* of thoſe Caſes or no? And here if you make thoſe *Superiors Judges* again, what you grant-

§. 3.

P. 230, 231.

ed before comes to nothing. This will be more clear by a Parallel caſe: Suppoſe the ſetting up the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel* had been done without ſuch an open Separation as that of *Jeroboam* was, but that the People had ſenſibly declined from the Worſhip of *God* at *Hieruſalem*, and had agreed to aſſemble at thoſe Places, the *High-Prieſt*, and the *Prieſts* and *Levites* having deſerted *Hieruſalem*, and approving this alteration of *God's Worſhip:* But although this might continue for many Years; yet ſome of the *inferior Prieſts* and others of the People reading the *Book* of the *Law*, they find the Worſhip of *God* much altered from what it ought to be, which they publiſh and declare to others, and bring many of the People to be of their *Mind*; but the *High-Prieſt* and his *Clergy* (foreſeeing how much it will be to their Prejudice to bring Things into their due Order) they reſolutely oppoſe it. I pray tell me now, what were to be done in this caſe? Muſt the People ſtand wholly to the Judgment of thoſe *Superior Prieſts*, who have declared themſelves to be utterly averſe from any *Reformation*? And if a *Council* be called, is it reaſonable or juſt, that he ſhould ſit as *Preſident* in it, becauſe he pretends to be the *Head over the Members*? *and that if Superiors be once accuſed as Parties, all Order and Peace is gone?* Is there any way left or no, whereby the *Church* of *Iſrael* might be reformed? *Yes*, ſay you, *by a General Council*; but, Muſt it be ſuch a *General Council*, wherein the *High-Prieſt* ſits as *Preſident*, and all who ſit with him ſworn to do nothing againſt him? Is this a *Free and General Council* likely to reform theſe things? And is it not all the *Juſtice* in the World, that ſuch a *Council* ſhould be truly *Free and General*, and thoſe freely heard who complain of theſe as great Corruptions? and that before the moſt equal and indifferent *Judges*; or, in caſe ſuch cannot be aſſembled, that by the *Aſſiſtance* of the *civil Power*, the *Church* may be reformed by its *Parts*: ſo that ſtill theſe *Parts* be willing to give an account of what they do before any *Free and General Council*, where the main Party accuſed ſits not as *Preſident* in it? *But what then*, may you ſay? *will you allow all Inferiors to proceed to a Reformation, in caſe the Superiours do not preſently conſent?* No: but Men ought firſt to exhibit their Complaints of Abuſes, and the *Reaſons* againſt them, to thoſe who are actually the *Superiors* of the *Church*; and that with all due Reverence to Authority; but if, notwithſtanding this, they declare themſelves wilful and obſtinate in defence of thoſe Things, by the Concurrence of the *Supreme Power* they may lawfully and juſtly proceed to a *Reformation.*

Q. 4. P. 231. *Well* (but you ſay) *all this comes not to your caſe, for the Pope was not juſtly accuſable of any Crime; for you deny not, but that other Biſhops in Council may proceed againſt the Pope himſelf, if the caſe do neceſſarily require it, as if he be a Heretick.* If you will then grant, that in ſome Caſes, as in that of *Hereſie*, the *Pope* may be excepted againſt as a *Party*, you deſtroy all that ever you ſay beſides. For when the Pope is accuſed for *Hereſie* in a *Council*, who muſt ſit as *Preſident* in that *Council?* The Pope himſelf, or not? If the Pope muſt ſit as Preſident, (for the *Head*, you ſay ſtill, *muſt be over the Members)* Do you think he will ever be condemned for *Hereſie*, if he hath the ſupream Management of the *Council?* If he may not ſit as *Preſident*, then, by the ſame Reaſon he ought not to do it, when he is accuſed of *Error* or *Uſurpation*; but the other *Biſhops* of the *Church*, met together by the *Aſſiſtance* of *Chriſtian Princes* in a *Free* and *General Council*, ought to be *Judges* in that caſe, as well as the former. And this is no more than is agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*; for if they had ſuffered the Popes to have been *Preſidents* in them,

or

or have had that *Power* over them, which the *Pope's* had in the *Council* of *Trent*. Do you think they could have done ſo to the preſent *Pope's* as they did? But tht *Popes* were grown wiſer afterwards; they had theſe Examples freſh in their Memory, and therefore they were reſolved never to be ridden by *General Councils* more. And thence came that continual Oppoſition to all Propoſals of the *Emperor* for a *General Council*, till Neceſſity put the *Pope* upon yielding to it: Thence came the Reſolution at *Rome*, not to venture any more *Councils* in *Germany*, for that Place breathed too much Freedom for the *Pope's* Intereſt, though this were moſt vehemently deſired by both the *Emperor*, and *German Princes* and *Biſhops*: Thence, when a *Council* muſt be called, he ſummons it firſt at *Mantua*, then at *Vicenza*, and when none would come thither, at laſt he yields it ſhould be at *Trent*, a moſt inconvenient Place for the *Germans* to come to: When they were there, though all Art poſſible was uſed to prevent the mention of any thing of *Reformation*, yet ſometimes ſome free Words breaking out, troubled the *Legats*, who diſpatch Notice of it to *Rome*, and receive Inſtructions what to do; yet all could not prevent their Fears and Jealouſies, leſt ſomething concerning the *Pope's Incereſt* ſhould be diſcuſſed; upon which to make all ſure they tranſlate the *Council* to *Bononia*, and leave the Emperor's Biſhops to blow their Fingers at *Trent*. And when upon the Emperor and King of *France*'s Proteſtations, the *Pope* ſaw a Neceſſity of removing it back to *Trent* again, though any fair Pretence would have been taken to have diſſolved the *Council*; yet ſince that could not be, the greateſt Care muſt be uſed to ſpin out the time, in hopes of ſome Occurrence happening, which might give a plauſible Pretext for breaking it up. But to be ſure nothing muſt paſs, but what was privately diſpatched to *Rome* and approved there firſt, (a good ſure way to prevent any Miſchief) and thence the *Holy-Ghoſt came in a Portmanteau* once or twice a Week, as the common *by-word* was then. But when, notwithſtanding all this, the grand Points of the *Reſidence* and Power of *Biſhops* were ſo hotly debated by the *Spaniſh Biſhops*, What Arts were uſed to divert them! When that would not do, How they bait them in *Council* by the flouting *Italians!* What private *Cabals* were kept by the *Legats*, what diſpatching and poſting to *Rome*, what Numbers of jolly *Italians* are made *Biſhops*, and ſent away to over-vote them? And when the *French-Biſhops* were come, what Spies did they keep upon them, what Bones were thrown to divide the *French* and *Spaniſh Biſhops*, what careſſing the *Cardinal* of *Lorrain* to bring him off by the Court of *Rome?* And when any others durſt ſpeak freely, What Checks and Frowns, and Diſgraces did they meet with? And all this to keep the *Pope* ſafe, who was ſtill in bodily Fear till the *Council* was ended to his mind; and then what Rejoycing, that they had cheated the World ſo, that that which was intended to clip the Wings of the Court of *Rome*, had confirmed and advanced the *Intereſt* of it. This was truly the *Head's preſiding over the Members*: For all the Life and Motion they had, proceeded from the *Influence* of their *Head*, the *Pope*: Call you this *Preſiding in a Council?* It is rather *riding of it*, that by the *ſpurring* ſome and *bridling* others, they may go juſt as the *Pope* would have them. And that this is a true Account of it, appears, notwithſtand whatever your *Cardinal Palavicino* hath been able to object againſt the impartial Hiſtory of it; whoſe two Volumes pretended in Anſwer to it, conſiſt of ſo many Impertinencies, and hath ſo very little material in it, that a *Roman Catholick* himſelf hath declared to the World, that he hath done more Diſſervice to the *Church* of *Rome* by his *Anſwer*, than ever Father *Paul* did by his Hiſtory: *Cæſar Aquilinus de tribus hiſtoricis Concilii Trident. p.* 49, 51.

By

By whom, his two great Books are compared to thoſe *Night-Birds* that make a great ſhew, but are all Feathers and very little Fleſh. This then being the way of management of Things at *Trent*, judge you or any reaſonable Man, Whether the *Proteſtants* have not juſt Cauſe to except againſt the *Preſidentſhip* which the *Pope* had in that *Council*; and name you any *General Council* (that was truly accounted ſo) where-ever he had any thing like it? The Particulars you mention, will be conſidered afterwards.

§. 5. Ibid. But you ſay, *All this was becauſe the Pope was not juſtly accuſable of any Crime, but what muſt involve not only the Council, but the whole Church as much as himſelf.* If ſo, there was the greater Reaſon that he ſhould leave it to the *Church* in a *Free Council* to have impartially debated Things, without his acting and interpoſing ſo much as he did. But the *Pope* was wiſer than to think ſo; he knew there were many Things in the *Court* of *Rome* which many other *Biſhops* ſtruck at, as well as the *Proteſtants*; and that they deſired a *Reformation* of *Abuſes* as well as the other, eſpecially the *German*, *French*, and *Spaniſh Biſhops*. Nay, it is ſtrange to ſee how much Intereſt or Prejudice blinds Men, that they will not acknowledge now that there was any ſuch need of *Reformation*, when *Pope Adrian* VI. confeſſed at the *Dyet* at *Norimberg*, *A. D.* 1522. by *Cheregatus* his *Legat*, that the *Popes* themſelves had been the Fountain and Cauſe of all thoſe Evils in the Church: In theſe remarkable Words (part of which have been cited already on another Occaſion) *Scimus in hâc ſancta Sede, aliquot jam annis, multa abominanda fuiſſe, abuſus in Spiritualibus, exceſſus in mandatis, & omnia deniq; in perverſum mutata. Nec mirum, ſi ægritudo à capite in membra, à ſummis Pontificibus in alios Prælatos deſcenderit. Omnes nos (ſc. Prælati Eccleſiaſtici) declinavimus, unuſquiſq; in vias ſuas, nec fuit jamdiu, qui faceret bonum, non fuit uſq; ad unum. Quamobrem neceſſe eſt, ut omnes demus gloriam Deo, & humiliemus animas noſtras ei: videat unuſquiſq; noſtrûm unde exciderit, & ſe potius quilibet judicet, quàm à Deo in virga furoris ſui judicari velit. Qua in re quod ad nos pertinet, pollicebris, Nos omnem operam adhibituros, ut primum Cueria hæc, unde forte omne hoc malum proceſſit reformetur: ut ſicut inde corruptio in omnes inferiores emanavit, ita ab eadem ſanitas & reformatio omnium emanet. Ad quod procurandum nos tanto arctius obligatos reputamus, quando univerſum mundum hujuſmodi reformationem avidius deſiderare videmus.* Can you now for ſhame ſay, *There was no need of Reformation at that time, and that the Popes were no more concerned than the whole Church?* The *whole Church* was indeed concerned, to ſee the *Court of Rome* reformed, and we ſee the Pope confeſſeth, that all the World deſired a *Reformation*. Doth not he ingenuouſly acknowledge, *That many abominable things had been for many Years in the Holy See* (and very *holy* it was, the mean time) *that all things were out of Order. That the Diſtemper had fallen from the Head to the Members, from the Popes to other Prelates, that they had all gone out of the way, that for a long time there had been none that did good, no not one. That therefore it was neceſſary, that all ſhould give Glory to God, and humble their Souls; and every one ſee whence he was fallen, and judge himſelf, rather than be judged by God in the Rod of his Fury. Wherefore* (ſaith he to his Legat) *thou ſhalt promiſe for us, that we will uſe our utmoſt Endeavour, that this Court, from whence all the Miſchief hath proceeded, may be reformed; that as the Corruption hath flowed from thence unto Inferiors, ſo the Health and Reformation of all may come from thence too. And we look on our ſelves as the more obliged to procure this, becauſe we ſee the whole World doth earneſtly deſire ſuch a Reformation.* Whom muſt we now believe

lieve, the *Pope* or you? the *Pope ingenuously* and *Christianly* bemoaning the *Corruptions* that had been in *Popes* themselves, and *from them* had spread to others; or you, who basely and untruly flatter the *Popes*, as though they needed no Reformation, but what concerned the *Council* and *Church*, as well as them? And the *Pope* gives you the true reason of it, *Because the Corruptions had been so great at* Rome, *that from thence they had spread over all others.* And can you think now, that the *Pope* was not justly accused of any Crime, but that he might sit as *President*, and manage the Affairs of the *Council*, as though there had been no need at all of any *Reformation*? But I remember an Observation of *Baronius*, that the Providence of God was so great in watching over the *Roman See*, that the *Popes* who were unfit to Govern it, seldom continued long in it; which he makes upon *Siricius* his favour to *Ruffinus*; and such a *Pope* was this *Adrian* accounted; this Confession of his being very distastful at *Rome*, he continued not long after it. But yet I know you have another Answer ready at hand, *That all this concerned only some Abuses in Manners and Management of Affairs, but nothing confessed to be amiss in Doctrine of Faith.* However, since it belonged to the *Council* to reform those Abuses, the Pope as an interessed Person ought not to have *presided* there, had it not been his Intention to have prevented any real *Reformation.* For all the Decrees of the *Council* to that Purpose were merely delusory and nothing of *Reformation* followed upon them; and the most important things to that end could never pass the *Council.* And if we gain this, that the *Pope* ought not to be *Judge*, where himself is concerned, as to the *Reformation* of *Abuses*; your former Assertion will make the other follow, *viz.* that in Case of *Heresie*, other *Bishops* may in *Council* proceed against the *Pope*, and, by the same Reason, when any *Errors* in Faith are charged upon him, or those who joyn in Communion with him; that such ought to be debated in a full and free *Council*, where no one concerned may preside to *over-awe* the rest. But such *Presidents* should be appointed as were in former *general Councils*, to whom it belonged to manage the Debates of the *Council*, without any such Power and Jurisdiction over them, as the *Pope* pretended to have, over all those assembled at *Trent.* And thus it appears, that what his Lordship said, was just and true, *That it is contrary to all Law, Divine, Natural and Humane, that the Pope should be chief Judge in his own Cause.* Your Instances of Pope *Leo* at the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and *Alexander* at the *Council* of *Nice*, will be considered in their due Place.

Which that we may come to, we must examine the *matter of Fact*, as to the *Pope's Presidency in general Councils.* His Lordship denying, *that the Pope did preside in the* Council of Nice, *either by himself or Legates, because* Hosius *was the President of it*; You Answer, *That* Hosius *did preside in that Council, and so did likewise* Vitus *and* Vincentius *Priests of* Rome, *but* (you say) *they all presided as the Pope's Legates and not otherwise. This* (you say) *appears by their subscribing the Conciliary Decrees in the first place, of which no other Account can be given; and because* Cedrenus *and* Photius *confess that the Pope gave Authority to this Council by his Legates; and in the old Preface to the Council of* Sardica, *it is said expressly, that* Hosius *was the Pope's Legate, and the same acknowledged by* Hincmarus, *and* Gelasius Cyzicenus, *whom you prove that* Photius *had read.* These being then all the Evidences you produce for the *Pope's* Presidency at the *Nicene Council*, we are obliged to afford them a particular Consideration. §. 6. Ibid.

Your first Argument, which *Bellarmine* and *Baronius* likewise insist on, is the Order of Subscription, *because the name of* Hosius *is set first*; but, if we mark

mark it, this Argument supposeth that which it should prove. For thus it proceeds, *Hosius* subscribed first, and therefore he was the *Roman Legate*; *Hosius* was the *Roman Legate*, and therefore he subscribed first: For it supposeth that the *first Subscription* did of *right* belong only to the *Roman Legate*; which we may as well deny, by an Argument just like it, *Vitus* and *Vincentius* did not subscribe first, and therefore the *Roman Legates* did not subscribe first. But you ask, *Why then did* Hosius *subscribe before the Patriarchs, and other Bishops, of greater Dignity than himself*? I answer, *Because* Hosius was *President* of the *Council*, and not they. But if you ask, *Why they chose him President before others*, the *Nicene Fathers* must answer you, and not I. But you say, *Cedrenus* and *Photius* confess, *That the Pope gave Authority to the Nicene Council by his Legates*; but, How comes that to prove, that *Hosius* was one of those *Legates*? *Photius* I am sure in his Book of the *seven Synods* (first published in *Greek* by *Justellus* out of the *Sedan Library*) says no such thing, but only mentions the two *Presbyters* who were there the *Roman Bishop's Legates*. And *Cedrenus* only mentions the *Roman Legates* amongst those who were *chief* in that *Council*, reckoning up the several *Patriarchs*. Your old Preface to the *Sardican Synod* (supposed of *Dionysius Exiguus*) is no competent Testimony, being of a later Author, and a *Roman* too: And *Hincmarus* is much younger than he, and therefore neither of their Testimonies hath any force against the ancient Writers; neither hath that of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, who lived under *Basiliscus*, *A. D.* 476. And that you may not think I do you wrong, to deprive you of his Testimony, you may see, How freely *Baronius* passeth his Censure upon those *Acts* under the Name of *Nicene Council*. *Sed, ut liberè dicam, somnia puto hæc omnia*; that I may speak freely, I account them no better than Dreams: And gives this very good Reason for it; because ever since the time of that *Council*, all Persons have been so extremely desirous of the *Acts* of that *Council*, and yet could never obtain them. But that which comes in the rear, transcends all the rest, which is, *That* Photius, *though a Schismatical Greek, and bitter Enemy of the Roman Church, witnesseth he had read this Book of* Gelasius, *and in it the above-cited Testimony*. And, I pray, What follows from thence? I hope *Photius* had read many other Books in that excellent Collection of his *Bibliotheca* besides this; and, Will you say, that *Photius* believed all that he there saith he had read? No, but you say, *That thereupon he confesses that the said* Hosius *was Legate for the Bishop of* Rome, *at the Council of* Nice. But you would have done well to have told us, Where this Confession is extant: for you seem to insinuate, as though it were in the same place where he mentions the reading this Book of *Gelasius*: but he only saith, That *Gelasius affirms it*, adding nothing at all of his own Judgment; and in his Book of the *Seven Synods*, where he declares his own Mind, he only mentions *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, as the *Legates* of the *Roman See*: And brings in *Hosius* afterwards, not joining him with *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, but with *Alexander* of *Constantinople*, and *Sylvester* and *Julius* of *Rome*, and *Alexander* and *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, whom he makes the *Chief in the Council*. For if *Photius* had intended to have made *Hosius* one of the Pope's *Legates*; there was all the Reason in the World he should have set him before *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, who were only *Presbyters*. And that the Pope had no other *Legates* there but these *two Presbyters*, we have the consent of all the ancient *Ecclesiastical Historians*; *Eusebius* mentioning the absence of the *Roman Bishop*, because of his *Age* adds, πρεσβύτεροι δ' αὐτοῦ πανόντες τὴν αὐτοῦ τάξιν ἐπλήρων, *His Presbyters being present, supplied his place*; so *Theodoret the Bishop of* Rome *could not be*

Baron. A. D. 305. sect. 6.

Photius in Biblioth. Cod. 88. p. 21.

Phot. de 7. Synod. &c. p. 163.

Euseb. Id. vita Constan. l. 3. c. 7. Theod. hist. Eccles. l. 1. c. 6.

be present δύο μόνοι πρεσβυτέρας ἀπέστειλε, *but he sent two Presbyters with Power to give his Assent*; not to preside over the Council. To the same Purpose *Sozomen*, *Nicephorus*, *Zonaras* speak. And it is very strange not one of all these *Historians* should mention this, if *Hosius* had presided there as *Legate* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*; and much more, that *Hosius* should not subscribe first in that *Capacity*, but only as *Bishop* of *Corduba*; for the *Pope's Legates* do not use to be so forgetful of their Place and Honour. It seems then very plain, that the *Pope* had no manner of *Presidency* at the *Council* of *Nice*? We come therefore to following Councils. *Sozom. l.* 1. *c.* 16. *Nicephor. l.* 8. *c.* 14.

You grant, *That in the second General Council*, Nectarius *Bishop of* Constantinople *was President, and not the Pope or his Legates. But the Reason* (you say) *was, because Pope* Damasus *having first summoned that Council to be held at* Constantinople, *and the Bishops of the Oriental Provinces being accordingly there met, the Pope, for some Reasons, altered his mind, and would have had them come to* Rome, *to joyn with the Bishops he had there assembled; which the Prelates at* Constantinople *refusing in a submissive manner, alledged such Arguments as the Pope remained satisfied with them. So the Council* (you say) *was upon the Matter held in two Places, at* Rome, *and* Constantinople. *So that while the Pope presided in the Council at* Rome, *and gave Allowance to their Proceedings at* Constantinople, *and that by reason of their Entercourse, they were looked on but as one Council in Effect, and the Pope to have presided therein.* In all this you discover, How much you take up things upon trust, and utter them with great Confidence, when they seem for your Purpose, although they are built upon notorious mistakes in *Ecclesiastical History*; as I shall make it plain to you this Answer of yours is. For neither was the *General Council* at *Constantinople* ever in the least summoned by the *Pope*, neither did it sit at the same time that the *Council* at *Rome* under *Damasus* did; neither were any Letters sent from that Council to the *Pope*; and therefore certainly *Pope Damasus* could not in any sense be said to *preside* there. These things, I know, make you wonder at first; but I shall undertake to make it appear, How much your great *Masters* (I need not name them to you) have abused your Credulity in this Story. We are to know then, that the Emperor *Theodosius* having been newly admitted into a share of the *Empire* by *Gratian*, and the *Eastern* Parts of it being alloted to him, he considering what a deplorable Condition the *Churches* of those Parts were in, by reason of the *Factions* and *Heresies* which were among them, judges it the best expedient to call a *Council* at *Constantinople*; to see if there were any hopes to bring the *Church* to any Peace. For this purpose 150 *Bishops* meet from the several *Provinces* at *Constantinople*, who condemn *Macedonius*, publish a new *Creed*, make several *Canons*, accept of *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Resignation of the *See* of *Constantinople*, chuse *Nectarius* in his room, and on the Death of *Meletius* at *Antioch*, elect *Flavianus* to succeed him, make a *Synodical Epistle* to the *Emperor Theodosius*, giving him an Account of their Proceedings, and so dissolve. This is the short of the Narration of it in *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*. But as soon as the Report of their Actions was come into the *Western Parts*, great Discontents are taken at their Proceedings, especially at the Election of *Flavianus* to the *See* at *Antioch*; because the *Church* of *Rome* had declared it-self in favour of *Paulinus* at *Antioch*, during the Life of *Meletius*, and therefore by no Means would they now yield to the Succession of *Flavianus*. Upon this, *Damasus* sollicits the *Emperour Gratian* for a *General Council*, that the Cause might be heard; and, that the *Theodoret. Eccles. hist. l.* 5. *c.* 8, 9. *Socrat. l.* 5. *cap.* 8: *Sozomen. l.* 7. *c.* 12.

p. 7. P. 232.

Eaſtern Biſhops might meet too, he ſends other Letters to *Theodoſius* to the ſame Purpoſe; upon the Intimation of which, the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, who either were detained at *Conſtantinople* by ſeveral Occurrences there, or were ſent again out of their *Provinces* thither, aſſemble together, and write a *Synodical Epiſtle* to *Damaſus*, *Ambroſius*, *Britton*, *Valerian*, *&c.* wherein they give an Account, Why they could not come to *Rome*, becauſe the *Eaſtern Churches* could not, in ſo divided and buſie a time, be left deſtitute of their *Biſhops*, and therefore they deſire to be excuſed; but however, they had ſent *Cyriacus*, *Euſebius*, and *Priſcianus*, as their *Legates* thither. This Excuſe the *Emperor Theodoſius* accepted of, and *Damaſus* and his Council were fain to reſt ſatisfied with it; only ſome of *Paulinus* his Party met him there, as *Epiphanius* and S. *Hierom* (although S. *Hierom* being no Biſhop, could only ſhew his good Will, and take that Opportunity of returning to *Rome*). What this Council did under *Damaſus*, we are to ſeek; for both *Baronius* and *Binius* confeſs, that the *Acts* of that Council, are wholly loſt; only *Baronius* thinks, the Condemnation of *Apollinaris* and *Timotheus* (which *Theodoret* mentions) to have been done before; and that *Paulinus* was reſtored to the *See* of *Antioch* by this Council: which ſeems the more probable, in that *Paulinus* the next Year returns to *Antioch*; and becauſe the *Biſhops* of *Rome* afterwards took his Part, and defended his Succeſſour againſt *Flavianus* in the *See* of *Antioch*. This being the true Account of thoſe Proceedings, let now any indifferent Perſon judge, Whether you were not much put to it, when you are fain to confound two Councils held at ſeveral times on ſeveral Occaſions, on Purpoſe to *blind* the Reader, and to make him believe that *Pope Damaſus* had ſomewhat to do, in *calling* and *preſiding* in the *General Council* at *Conſtantinople*; becauſe he requeſted the Meeting of the *Biſhops* again the Year after the *General Council*. And the Truth of this, is ſo plain, that *Baronius* and *Binius* confeſs the Difference of theſe two Councils, both as to the Times and occaſions of them. *Baronius* placeth the *Oecumenical Council* at *Conſtantinople*, *A. D.* 381. *Eucherius* and *Syagrius* being *COSS.* in *May*: But the other *Council* at *Conſtantinople*, he placeth the year after, *A. D.* 382. *Syagrius* and *Antonius COSS.* at which time likewiſe the Council at *Rome* ſate. And ſo *Binius* reckons this Council as a ſecond Council at *Conſtantinople* under *Damaſus*, and, in all things concerning the times of this and the former, follows *Baronius* exactly. So much are the two great Cardinals, *Bellarmine* and *Perron* miſtaken, when they would have the Council at *Conſtantinople* called *Oecumenical* on this Account, becauſe there was a Council at *Rome* ſitting under *Damaſus*, at the ſame time, approving what was done at *Conſtantinople*. Whereas the Occaſion of the Council at *Rome* was given by ſome of the laſt Acts of the *Oecumenical* Council, *viz.* the Election of *Flavianus*. But that this could not be, that thoſe two Councils at *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, ſhould ſit together at the ſame time, and on the ſame Account, appears by the *Synodical Epiſtle* of the Council the Year following ſent to *Damaſus*, which is exemplified both in *Binius* and *Baronius*, and is originally Extant in *Theodoret*. Although *Binius* placeth it at the end of the *Oecumenical* Council, but *Baronius* much more fairly in the next Year, as being the Act of the *ſecond* Council. Now there are two things in that *Synodical Epiſtle* by which I ſhall prove it impoſſible, that either the Letters of *Pope Damaſus* did concern the calling of the *Oecumenical* Council, or that the ſitting of the Council at *Rome*, and the *general* one at *Conſtantinople*, could be at the ſame time. The firſt is from the Date of thoſe Letters,

Baron Ann. 382. ſect. 17.

Annal. Ann. 381. ſect. 17.

A. D. 382. ſect. 45, &c.

Tom. 1. Concil. p. 686.

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 1. c. 5

Perron's Reply. l. 1. cap. 34.

Bin. Tom. 1. Concil. p. 665. Theod. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 9.

A. D. 382. ſect. 9.

Letters, which is thus expreſſed there: that they met together at *Conſtantinople*, having received the Letters which were ſent the Year before from them to the *Emperor Theodoſius*, μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀκυλείᾳ σύνοδον, *after the Synod at* Aquileia. Now the *Synod* at *Aquileia* by *Baronius* his Computation, was held the ſame Year *A. D.* 381. in which the *Oecumenical Council* at *Conſtantinople* was held, and much later in the Year too, for this was held in the *Nones* of *September*, and the other in *May*; and ſo much is likewiſe confeſſed by *Binius* in his Notes on that *Council*. Now let me demand of you, Whether is it impoſſible that *Damaſus* ſhould, by his *Letters*, ſummon the *Oecumenical Council*, when the date of thoſe Letters to *Theodoſius*, is ſo long after the ſitting of it? But beſides this, theſe *Eaſtern Biſhops* in that *Council*, which ſat after theſe Letters of *Damaſus*, clearly diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the *Oecumenical Council* of the Year foregoing: for, after they had given a brief Account of their Faith, they refer the Pope and *Weſtern Council* to that Declaration of Faith which had been made the *Year before* by the *Oecumenical Council* aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, τῷ πέρυσι ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει παρὰ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἑκατὸν συνόδου. Is it poſſible then any thing ſhould be more evident, than that this *Council* aſſembled upon the *Letters* of *Damaſus* to *Theodoſius*, and ſitting with the *Council* at *Rome*, is clearly diſtinct from the *Oecumenical Council* of *Conſtantinople*? And thus I hope I have diſpelled thoſe *Miſts* which you would caſt before the Readers Eyes, by confounding theſe two *Councils*, and thereby offering to prove, that the Pope had ſome kind of very remote Preſidency in the ſecond *General Council*. Which is ſo far from being true, that there is not any Intimation in any of the ancient Hiſtorians, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, or *Sozomen*, that the Pope, or any of the *Weſtern Biſhops*, had any thing at all to do in it. But you will ask, *How comes it then to be accounted an Oecumenical Council?* For this indeed *Baronius* would fain find out ſome hand that *Damaſus* had in it, or elſe he cannot conceive how it ſhould become *Oecumenical*; but all the Proof he produceth, is, *Becauſe in the Acts of the ſixth Council it is ſaid, that* Theodoſius *and* Damaſus *oppoſed* Macedonius: and ſo I hope he might do by declaring his conſent to the Doctrine decreed in this *Council*; not that thereby his Approbation made it *Oecumenical*. And, as that Doctrine was received, and that Confeſſion of *Faith* embraced all over the World, ſo that *Council* became *Oecumenical*. For I cannot ſee but that if *Damaſus* had ſtood up for *Macedonius*, if the Decrees againſt him had been received by the *Catholick Church*, it had been never the leſs *Oecumenical* in the Senſe of Antiquity: That Teſtimony which *Baronius* brings out of his own *Library*, and a Copy of the *Vatican*, expreſſing that *Damaſus* did ſummon the *Council* at *Conſtantinople*, is not to be taken againſt the conſent of the ancient *Church-Hiſtorians*; it being well known what *Intereſt* thoſe *Roman Copies* have a long time driven on. I deny not therefore but that the *Council* of *Conſtantinople* was aſſented to by *Damaſus*, and the *Weſtern Biſhops*, in the *Matters* of *Faith* there decided, but I utterly deny that *Damaſus* had any thing to do in the *Preſidency* over that *Council*. So that we find a *Council* always acknowledged to be *Oecumenical*, in which the Pope had no *Preſidency* at all; and this very Inſtance ſufficiently refutes your *Hypotheſis*, viz. *That the Pope's Preſidency is neceſſary to a General Council.*

Ann. 381. *ſect.* 80, *Tom.* 1. *Concil p.* 682.

§. 8. In the third *General Council* held at *Epheſus*, *A. D.* 431. it is agreed on both ſides, that S. *Cyril*, *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, was the *Preſident* of it: but the Queſtion is, In what Capacity he ſate there, whether in his own,

or as *Legate* of *Celeſtine Biſhop* of *Rome*? All the Proof you produce for the
P. 232. latter, is, *That it appears by a Letter written to him by the Pope, long before he ſent any other Legates to that Council; in which Letter he gives S.* Cyril *charge to ſupply his Place, as is teſtified by* Evagrius, Proſper, Photius, *and divers other Authors.* But here again you offer to confound two things, which are of a diſtinct Nature; for you would have your Reader believe, that this *Letter* was ſent by *Cæleſtine* to *Cyril*, in order to his *Preſidentſhip* in the *Council*, whereas this Letter was ſent the *Year* before, without any relation to the *Council*; as appears by the Series of the Story; which is briefly this: The Differences in the *Eaſtern Churches* increaſing about the Opinions broached by *Neſtorius*, *S. Cyril* of *Alexandria* chiefly appearing in Oppoſition to them, they both write (much about the ſame time) to Pope *Cœleſtine*, impeaching each other of Hereſie. But before *Cœleſtine* had read the Letters from *Neſtorius* in Vindication of himſelf, *Poſſidonius* a *Deacon* of *Alexandria* comes with ſeveral Diſpatches from *S. Cyril*, wherein a large Account is given of the Hereſie and Actions of *Neſtorius*; upon which the Pope calls a *Council* at *Rome*, and therein examines the Allegations on both ſides, which being done, the *Council* condemns *Neſtorius*, and paſſeth this Sentence on him, *That ten days ſhould be allowed him* (*after notice given*) *for his Repentance*; *and, in caſe of Obſtinacy, he ſhould be declared excommunicate.* And for executing this Sentence, *Cæleſtine* commits his Power to *Cyril*; not as though it belonged to the *Pope* only to do it, but that by this Means there might appear the *Conſent* of the *Weſtern* with the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, in putting *Neſtorius* out of the Communi-
Ann. 430. on of the *Catholick Church.* *S. Cyril* having received theſe Letters by the
ſect. 23. 25. return of *Poſſidonius*, dated the third of the *Ides* of *Auguſt*, as appears by the Letters extant in *Baronius*, calls a *Council* at *Alexandria*, in which four *Legates* are decreed to be ſent to *Conſtantinople* in purſuance of the Sentence againſt *Neſtorius*, they deliver the Letters of *Cœleſtine* and *Cyril* to him, he returns them no Anſwer at all, but addreſſes himſelf to the *Emperor Theodoſius*, and complains of the Perſecutions of *Cyril*, which occaſioned a very ſharp Letter of the *Emperor* to him, charging him with diſturbing the *Churches Peace.* But this was not all; for *Cyril* having with the *Synodical Epiſtle* of the *Council* of *Alexandria*, ſent twelve *Anathematiſms* to be ſubſcribed by *Neſtorius*, he was ſo far from it, that he charges *Cyril* with the *Hereſie* of *Apollinarius* in them, and ſends them to *Johannes Antiochenus*, who (with the *Syrian Biſhops* of his *Dioceſe*) joyn with *Neſtorius* in the Impeachment of *Cyril.* So that by this means the Sentence againſt *Neſtorius* could not be put in Execution, becauſe of the diſſent of the *Eaſtern Biſhops*, and that *S. Cyril* ſtood charged with *Hereſie* as well as the other. Things being grown to this height, *Theodoſius* calls a *General Council* at *Epheſus*, to be held the enſuing Year, writes to all the *Metropolitans* to appear there at the time appointed, and bring ſuch *Biſhops* with them, as they thought convenient; but what Contentions happened there between the two Parties, is not here our Buſineſs to relate; but the *Emperor* foreſeeing what Diſturbance was like to be there, ſent the Count *Candidianus* for better Management of the Affairs of the *Council.* Now *S. Cyril* and his Party having the Advantage of the other, both in Number and Forwardneſs of being there, *Cyril* ſits as *Preſident* among them. The Queſtion now is, Whether he ſate there by virtue of that *Legantine* Power he had for the excommunicating *Neſtorius* the Year before, or not? or only as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and chief of that Party? But by what Authority he ſhould challenge to be

Preſident

Preſident of the *Council*, becauſe he had been deputed by *Cæleſtine* to act his part in the excommunicating *Neſtorius*, I think is ſomewhat hard to underſtand. Neither doth any thing appear in the *Council* which gives any ground for it; for *Cyril* ſubſcribes to it meerly as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, the Council on all occaſions call him, and *Memnon* of *Epheſus* their προέδρου, and when they ſpeak of *Cæleſtine*, after his *Legates* came, they ſay, He did only συνεδρεύειν *aſſiſt together with them in Council:* But, Why ſhould *Cæleſtine* ſend other *Legates* afterwards, *viz. Arcadius*, *Philippus*, and *Projectus*, if S. *Cyril* ſupplied the Pope's Place there already? Yet, although we ſhould grant, that before the *Legates* came, *Cyril* did ſupply the place of *Cæleſtine*, it doth not follow, that he ſate *Preſident* of the *Council* on that Account: but only to ſhew the Concurrence of *Cæleſtine* with the *Council* in matter of Doctrine; and this there was good Reaſon for, becauſe *Cæleſtine* had fully declared himſelf to *Cyril* concerning that already. And this was uſual in the *Councils*, as appears in this very *Council* by *Flavianus Biſhop* of *Philippi*; ſubſcribing likewiſe in the place of *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*. So that if we grant *Cyril* to ſit in the *Council* as *Legate* of *Cæleſtine*, yet it doth not follow, that he was *Preſident* of the *Council* in that Capacity; for the other was only to *teſtifie* his *Conſent*, this required a particular *Commiſſion* to that purpoſe. So that he might give a *Vote* in the *Council* for *Cæleſtine*, and yet ſit (as he did) *Preſident* of the *Council* as *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*. Thus it being manifeſted, that in the three firſt General *Councils*, the Pope ſate not either by himſelf or his *Legates* as *Preſident*, it is ſufficiently proved thereby, that his *Preſidency* is no neceſſary Condition to a *General Council*; and if not, then we ſay, It is unjuſt and unreaſonable he ſhould challenge it, when he is the Perſon mainly accuſed. But in the mean while it is not at all neceſſary, that we ſhould deny that ever he ſate as *Preſident* in any other *General Council*, for being the *Biſhop* of the *chief See*, Why ſhould he in a caſe of general Concernment to the *Church*, as that of *Chalcedon*, not be allowed by his *Legates* to have the *prime Place*? But there wants ſufficient Evidence too, that theſe were properly the *Preſidents* of that *Council*. In the next at *Conſtantinople* you grant, that *Eutychius Biſhop of Conſtantinople* ſate *Preſident*; but you ſay, *That he acknowledged this Privilege to be due to Pope* Vigilius. But, How came it to paſs then, that he would not ſit there, though then at *Conſtantinople*? It appears by the many frivolous *Excuſes* he made, that he durſt not truſt himſelf in the *Council*, for fear that Authority ſhould not be given him which he expected. For that hath always been the Subtilty of the Popes in thoſe elder Times, when they began to encroach, not to venture themſelves in preſence in a *General Council*, for fear of Oppoſition, but by their abſence they reſerved to themſelves a Liberty to declare their diſſent, when any Acts paſſed which did not pleaſe them. As *Leo* did in the caſe of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. But however, this is evident from the fifth *General Council*, that the Pope's Preſidency was not then thought at all neceſſary. What was done in following *Councils*, is not material to our purpoſe, becauſe it doth already ſufficiently appear, that the Pope's *Preſidency* is not neceſſary to a *General Council*, and therefore you conclude with a notorious Falſity, in ſaying with *Bellarmin*, *That the Pope hath been poſſeſt full* 1500 *Years of the right of preſiding in General Councils.*

His Lordſhip's third Exception againſt the *Council* of *Trent*, is, *That the place was not free, but either in, or too near the Pope's Dominions.* To this you Anſwer, *That certainly* Trent *is not within the Pope's Dominion:* but it is well enough known, that *Trent* was under the ſole Juriſdiction of the *Biſhop*, §. 9. Ibid.

Biſhop, and the *Biſhop* to be ſure was under the Pope's Dominion, having been particularly obliged too, by receiving a *Cardinal's Hat*. And therefore it was not without juſt Reaſon that the *Place* was proteſted againſt, not only by the *German Proteſtants*, as being out of *Germany* where the *States* of the *Empire* had often promiſed the *Council* ſhould be; at the Diet at *Norimberg* 1524, at *Auſpurg* 1526. *Spire* 1529. *Ratisbone* 1532, 1541. again at *Norimberg* 1543. and laſt of all at *Spire* 1544. but as a moſt inconvenient *Place* for them to come to; being a *Week's Journey* (as they ſay) from the Borders of *Germany*, ſeated in a barren and almoſt inacceſſible Place, having no freedom of Paſſage almoſt amidſt the *Alps*: This place, I ſay, was not only proteſted againſt by them, as being contrary to the Promiſes made to them; but the *German Biſhops* made it their earneſt Requeſt, that the *Council* might be held in *Germany*; for at *Trent*, they ſaid they could neither be preſent themſelves, nor ſend any *Legates* thither: and particularly inſtance in the unpaſſableneſs of the *Alps* between them and *Trent*? and that it was rather in the Borders of *Italy* than *Germany*. And the Pope himſelf in his Anſwer to the *German Biſhops*, and the *Emperor's Proteſtation* upon the removal of the *Council* from *Trent* to *Bononia*, inſiſts upon the Inconvenience of *Trent* for the long Reſidence of the *Biſhops* there. And in behalf of the *Proteſtants* declaring againſt this *Place* in regard of the unſafeneſs of it, the Places about being all under the Pope's Authority: *du Ranchin* tells you, *That it is an Exception allowable by the Doctors of the Canon-Law, who all agree, that an Exception againſt the Safety of the Place is pertinent, and ought to be admitted; that it is good, both by the Civil Law and the Law of Nature, that a Man ſummon'd to a Place where any danger threatens him, is not bound to appear, nor to ſend his Proctor, and that a Judge is bound to aſſign the Parties a place of Safety for the hearing of their Cauſe, otherwiſe there is juſt cauſe of Appeal.* That the *Council* of *Piſa* excepted againſt appearing at *Rome* on the ſame Accounts, and if they durſt not venture to *Rome* upon the offer of Safe-conduct, much leſs reaſon had the Proteſtants to do it, to ſuch a Place as *Trent*, a City, by reaſon of the neighbouring Woods very ſubject to Treacheries and Ambuſhments; that the very deſigning ſuch a Place yielded ground of Fear and Suſpicion, eſpecially to ſuch as had not forgotten the late Examples of *John Huſſe*, and *Hierom* of *Prague* at the *Council* of *Conſtance*. That the *States* of *Germany* in the *Diet* at *Francford*, *A. D.* 1338. pleaded the Nullity of the Pope's Excommunication of *Lewis* 5, becauſe he was cited to *Avignon* where the Pope was *Lord* of the *Place*; and the place being not free for him to appear at, the ſummons were not *Canonical*, but void and invalid in Law. This and many other Inſtances are there brought by the ſame learned Author, to juſtifie the *Proteſtants* in not appearing at *Trent*, becauſe the Place was not free nor ſafe; although the Author ſeems not to have been one himſelf. All theſe things being conſidered, he muſt have been an *Infidel indeed*, who would pronounce *Trent* to have been the moſt indifferent place for both Parties to meet at. For what you ſay, *That it might have been as unſafe for the Pope and his Party, if it had been in* Germany: there is no Reaſon at all for it, becauſe of the *Emperors* openly owning that Intereſt; but if you plead the Wars of *Germany* which then broke out, I hope that may ſerve as a further Plea for the *Proteſtants*, who were in a good Condition to go to a free *Council* about matters of *Religion*, when a War was already begun upon them upon the account of *Religion*, as moſt evidently appears, not only by the Supplies ſent by the Pope, but by the Tranſactions afterwards between the *Pope* and the *Emperor*, in ſome of which it is expreſly confeſſed.

Review of the Council of *Trent*, *l.* 1. *c.* 7.

But

But ſuppoſing the place had been never ſo free, there is another great Exception remaining ſtill, *viz. That none had Suffrage, but ſuch as were ſworn to the Pope and Church of* Rome, *and profeſſed Enemies to all that call'd for Reformation or a free Council.* To this you Anſwer, 1. *That it is no new thing for Biſhops to take an Oath of Canonical Obedience to the Pope; for St.* Gregory *mentions it as an ancient Cuſtom in his Time; and therefore this Objection would ſerve as much againſt ancient General Councils as this of* Trent. 2. *That the Biſhop's Oath doth not deprive them of the liberty of their Suffrage; nay it doth not ſo much as oblige them not to proceed and vote even againſt the Pope himſelf, if they ſee juſt cauſe; but only that they will be obedient to him, ſo long as he commands things ſuitable to the will of God and the Sacred Canons of the Church.* But what Falſhood and Fraud lies in both theſe Anſwers, it will not take up much time to diſcover. Could you without bluſhing offer to ſay, *That no other Oath was taken by the Biſhops at the Council of* Trent *than what was taken in ancient General Councils?* For ſo much your Words imply, when you ſay, *That the ſame Objection would have held as well againſt them as this of* Trent. Why do you not produce ſome Inſtance of an *Oath* taken to the *Pope* in any of the firſt *General Councils?* I dare challenge you to bring any Footſteps of any ſuch thing in any ancient *Council*; and you muſt needs have exceedingly hardened your Forehead that durſt let fall any thing tending that way. It was in much later Times before that Oath of *Canonical Obedience* from *Biſhops* to their *Metropolitan* came up; and when it did, no more took any ſuch Oath to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, than ſuch as were under his *Metropolitical Juriſdiction.* In your Citation of *Gregory*, you would let us ſee how far you can out-go *Bellarmine* himſelf in theſe Things. For *Bellarmine* only proves, that it is not new for *Biſhops* to take an *Oath* of *Canonical Obedience* to the *Pope*; but you ſay, *That* Gregory *mentions it as an ancient Cuſtom in his Time*, which is egregiouſly falſe. For there is not one Word in all that *Epiſtle* implying any thing of former Cuſtom, neither doth it contain an Oath of *Canonical Obedience* made by every *Biſhop* at his Conſecration, but only a *Form* of Renunciation of Hereſie by any *Biſhop* who comes off from it to the *Catholick Church*, and ſo the Title of it is, *Promiſſio cujuſdam Epiſcopi hæreſin ſuam anathematizantis*; and what is this, I pray, to the Oath taken by every *Biſhop* at his Conſecration? Wherein he ſwears, *to defend and retain the Roman Papacy, and the Royalties of S.* Peter (ſo their new *Pontifical* hath it, whereas in the old one it was *regulas Sanctorum Patrum*) *againſt all Men.* And was this no more than a bare Oath of *Canonical Obedience?* The firſt mention we meet with of any Oath of *Canonical Obedience* taken by *Men* in *Orders*, is in the eleventh *Council of* Toledo, cap. 10. held, ſaith *Loyaſa*, *A. D.* 675. and therein indeed they ſay it is *expedible*, a matter they judge *expedient*, *That thoſe in Orders ſhould,* Promiſſionis ſuæ vota ſub cautione ſpondere, *bind themſelves by promiſe to obſerve the Catholick Faith, and obey their Superiors:* but here is nothing at all concerning any Oath to be taken by all *Biſhops* to the *Pope*, though *Bellarmine* produce it to that purpoſe. For that was much later than the time of this *Council*, it beginning at the time of the Conteſts between the *Popes* and *Princes* about *Inveſtitures*; then the *Pope* to ſecure as many as he could to himſelf, binds them in Oath of *Fealty* and *Allegiance*, rather than *Canonical Obedience* to himſelf; by which, as *Spalatenſis* truly ſaith, *he makes the Biſhops his Slaves and Vaſſals.* And therefore in another Place, he juſtly wonders, that any *Chriſtian Princes* will ſuffer any *Biſhops* to make that *Homage* by this Oath to the *Pope*, which is only due to themſelves. For, ſaith he, *That Oath which was only of Canonical*

§. 10.

P. 233.

De Concil. l. 1. c. 22.

Greg. ep. l. 10. c. 31.

De Repub. Eccleſ. Tom. 1. l. 4. c. 7. ſect. 52. Tom. 2. l. 6. c. 7 n. 102.

nonical Obedience before, they have turned it into abſolute Homage to the Pope, ſo that none can be conſecrated Biſhops without it. But yet you would perſwade us, *that notwithſtanding this Oath, they may proceed and vote againſt the Pope himſelf.* Surely, Pope *Pius* 2. was of another mind, who (as the *Appendix* to *Urſpergenſis* tells us) in an Epiſtle to the Chapter at *Mentz*, ſaith, *That to ſpeak Truth againſt the Pope, is to break their Oath.* But all this will more evidently appear, if we produce the Form of the Oath it ſelf, I mean not that in the old *Roman Pontifical*, but that which was taken in *Julius* the *third*'s time, which was in the time of the ſitting of the *Council* of *Trent*. In which, beſides in the firſt place a Promiſe of Obedience to the Pope and his Succeſſors, and a Promiſe of Concealment of all his *Councils*, there are theſe expreſs Words, *Jura, honores, privilegia, & auProteſtatio adverſus Concil. Trident.* p. 22. *A. D.* 1563. *thoritatem Romanæ Eccleſiæ, Domini noſtri Papæ & ſucceſſorum prædictorum conſervare, defendere, augere, & promovere curabo. I will take care to preſerve, defend, increaſe, and promote the Rights, Honours, Privileges, and Authority of the Roman Church, and of our Lord the Pope and his Succeſſors aforeſaid*; but leſt this ſhould not be full enough, there follows another Clauſe, *Nec ero in Concilio, in facto, ſeu tractatu, in quibus contra Dominum noſtrum, vel Romanam Eccleſiam, aliqua ſiniſtra ſive præjudicialia perſonarum, juris, honoris, ſtatus, & poteſtatis eorum, machinentur. Et, ſi talia à quibuſdam tractari cognovero, aut procurari, impediam hoc pro poſſe; & quantocyus potero commodè ſignificabo eidem Domino noſtro, vel alteri per quem ad ipſius notitiam poſſit pervenire. I will not be in any Council, Action, or Debate, in which they ſhall plot or contrive any thing to the Prejudice of our Lord the Pope or the Roman Church, or of any Perſons, Right, Honor, State or Power, belonging to them.* Was not this now a fit Oath to ſend Biſhops to a free Council with? where the main thing to have been debated had been the uſurped Power of the Pope and *Church* of *Rome*. He that can believe a *Council* made up of ſuch Perſons (who judge this Oath lawful) to be *Free*, may think thoſe Men free to rebel againſt their *Sovereign*, who had but juſt taken an Oath of *Allegiance* to him. Not that the Pope had any Right or Power to impoſe it, or that the Oath is in it ſelf lawful; but that thoſe who judged both theſe things true, could not poſſibly be more obliged, not to act in any meaſure againſt the Pope than they were. And therefore the Pope knew what he did, when he utterly denied to abſolve the *Biſhops* of this Oath, which the *States* of the *Empire* preſſed him to, as neceſſary in order to the *Freedom* of the *Council*: *No*, ſaid he, *I do not mean to have my Hands bound up ſo.* He knew well enough, how much his *Intereſt* lay at Stake, if the *Biſhops* were releaſed of this *Oath*, and therefore he was reſolved to hold them faſt enough to himſelf by it. What Reſtrictions or Limitations can you now find out in this Oath, whereby theſe *Biſhops* might freely debate the Power and Authority of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*? They that ſwear, *not to be in any Council or Debate againſt the Pope*, are not like to make any *Free Council* about the matters then in Diſpute. And, Do you think now the *Proteſtants* had no cauſe to except againſt this *Council*, where all the *Biſhops* were ſwore before-hand to maintain and defend that which they moſt complained of? And, Were there nothing elſe but this *Oath*, ſo unheard of a thing in all ancient *Councils*, ſo contrary to the ends of a *Free Council*; this were enough to keep them from ever ſubmitting to the Judgment of ſuch a *Council* as that of *Trent* was.

And yet this is not all neither; for his Lordſhip adds, *That the Pope himſelf, to ſhew his Charity, had declared and pronounced the Appellants Hereticks, before they were condemned by the Council. I hope,* ſaith he, *an Aſſembly*

Assembly of Enemies are no lawful Council; and I think that the Decrees of such a one are, omni jure nulla, *and carry their Nullity with them through all Law.* All the Answer you give to this, is, *That the Pope did nothing therein but in pursuance of the Canons of the Church which required him so to do, and of the Decrees of General Councils, which had already condemned their Opinions for Heresie.* You mend the matter well; for it seems the *Pope* not only did so, but was bound to do so. For shame then never talk of a *Free* and *General Council*, to debate those things which you say were already condemned for Heresies by *General Councils*. One may now see, What the *safe Conduct* had been for the *Protestants*, if they had come to *Trent*; for it seems they were condemned for *Hereticks* before they came there, and nothing then was wanting but Execution. But if the *Protestants* Opinions were condemned for *Heresies* before by *General Councils*, Why was the *Council* of *Trent* at all summoned? Why was the World so deceived with the Promises of a *Free* and *General Council*? Why did they proceed to make new *Decrees* in these matters? In what ancient *general* Councils will you shew us the *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome* decreed, that those who held the contrary should be accounted *Hereticks*? Speak them out, that we may find our selves therein condemned. Give us a *Catalogue* of the rest of your *Tridentine Articles*, and name us the *general Councils* in which they were decreed as they are there? But this is not a work for you to meddle in. However, What Folly and Madness would it be to account that a *Free Council*, in which the Things to be debated are looked on as condemned Heresies already, and no Liberty allowed to any Persons to debate them? Ibid.

The last Exception you say of his Lordship, is, *against the small Number of Bishops present at the Tridentine Council; and in the first Place he mentions the Greeks whom he takes* (say you) *to have been unjustly excluded.* To this you say, 1. *The Pope called all who had right to come?* (*you should say, all whom he would judge to have right to come*). 2. *The Greeks, by reason of their notorious Schism, had excluded themselves:* And, Might not the *Greeks* (if they were in Condition) every whit as well hold a *general Council* among themselves, and say, The *Latins* had excluded themselves by their notorious *Schism*? You say, *It is confessed that no known Heretick or Schismatick, hath right to sit in Council*; but still you make your own selves Judges, Who are Orthodox, and who Hereticks and Schismaticks; and, Might not the *Greeks* again say the very same of you? And for all that I know, with much more Truth and reason. It was then very like to be a *general* Council, when the *Pope* and his Party must sit as *Judges*, Who were to be admitted, and who not: Might not the *Donatists* in *Africa* have call'd their *Council* of *seventy Bishops* an *Oecumenical Council* upon the same Grounds, because they accounted none to belong to the Church, but such as were of their own Party? And if they did not belong to the *Church*, they could have no right to sit in *Council*. It seems, the more uncharitable you are, the freer your *Councils* are; For the *Pope* may, by pronouncing Men *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, keep them from coming to *Councils*, and appearing against him there; and the *Council* be never the less *General* for all that. If the *Greeks* be not called to the *Council*, they may thank themselves, they are *notorious Schismaticks*, and, if we believe you, *Hereticks* too; If the *Protestants* be not admitted, it is their own Fault they are condemned *Hereticks*; if none appear from any other more remote *Churches*, still the same Plea will serve to exclude them all. For my part I much approve §. II. Ibid.

the ſaying of *Eugenius* in the *Council* of *Florence*, when they ſpake of the paucity of *Biſhops* for a *General Council*, *That where he and the Emperour, and the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *were preſent, there was a General Council, though there were no more.* And *Pope Pius the fourth* might have ſaved a great deal of money in his Purſe, with which he maintained his *Biſhops Errant* at that *Council*, had he been of the ſame mind. But the Scene of things was altered in *Europe*; there were ſuch Clamours made for a *General Council*, that ſomething muſt be done to ſatisfie the World; and, as long as the *Pope* knew how to manage the Buſineſs, there would be nothing could breed ſo great danger in it. He therefore barely ſummons a *Council*, without acquainting any of the *Eaſtern Patriarchs* with it (as was the Cuſtom in the ancient *General Councils*) among whom it was debated after the *Emperor's* indicting of it; theſe ſummoned by the *Emperor's* Order their *Metropolitans*, the *Metropolitans* the *Biſhops*; the *Biſhops* they agreed among themſelves, who ſhould go to the Council, who on that Account might be ſaid to repreſent thoſe Churches from whence they came. What was there like this in the Council of *Trent*? What Meſſages were there ſent to the *Eaſtern Patriarchs of Conſtantinople*, *Antioch* and *Alexandria*? What *Metropolitans* came thence? What *Biſhops* by the Conſent of thoſe Churches? And, if there were nothing of all this, What Boldneſs is it to call this a *General* Council? Juſt by the ſame Figure that your Church is called the Catholick Church; which is, by an inſufferable *Catachreſis*. And muſt ſix fugitive *Greek Biſhops* give Vote here for all the *Eaſtern* Churches; and two fugitive *Engliſh* Biſhops for all the Church of *England*? I do not then at all wonder, How eaſily this might be a *general* Council, though there were ſo very few Perſons in moſt of the *Seſſions* of it. But you ſay, *There was no need of any particular ſending from the Greeks, as the Caſe then ſtood, and ſtill continues; 'tis ſufficient they were called by the Pope.* Sufficient indeed for your Purpoſe; but not at all for a *general* Council; For if the *Greek* Churches had been in Condition to have ſent an equal number of *Eaſtern* to *Weſtern* Biſhops, the *Popes* would rather have loſt all, than ſtood to the Judgment of ſuch a *Council*. And this you know well enough, for all your ſaying, *That the Greek Church condemns the Proteſtants*: You dread the *Greek* Churches meeting you in a *Free General* Council; and therefore to prevent that, they muſt be called *Schiſmaticks*, and excluded as ſuch, though you would never permit the debate of the *Schiſm* in a *Free* Council. *As the Caſe then ſtood, and ſtill continues, there was no need of ſending.* And, Why ſo? Is it becauſe thoſe Churches were then under Perſecutions, and are ſtill, and therefore there is no Hopes that the Biſhops ſhould come to a *general* Council? But all that thence follows, is, that as things ſtood then, and do ſtill, there can be no truly *general* Council; and that is a juſt Inference: but I ſuppoſe you rather mean, becauſe thoſe Churches were then in *Schiſm*, and are ſtill, which ſtill diſcovers what a wonderful good Opinion you have of your ſelves, and how uncharitable you are to all others. And ſo great is the Excellency of your Biſhops, that one of them may repreſent a *whole Nation*; and ſo about *fifty* will be more than ſufficient for the whole World. And therefore I rather wonder there were ſo many Biſhops at *Trent*; for, if the *Pope* pleaſed, as he made *Patriarchs*, *Primates*, and *Arch-Biſhops* of ſuch Places where they never durſt go (which he knew well enough) it had been but appointing ſuch to ſtand for ſuch a *Nation*, and ſuch for another, and a ſmall number might have ſerved turn, without putting any to the trouble of coming from any foreign *Countreys* at all. For otherwiſe, if we go about to examine

P. 234.

the

the numbers of *Bishops*, by their Proportions to the *Churches* they come from, as it ought to be in *General Councils*, we shall find a most pitiful Account in the *Council* of *Trent*.

For as his Lordship saith, *Is it to be accounted a General Council, that in many Sessions had scarce ten Arch-Bishops, or forty or fifty Bishops present? In all the Sessions under* Paul III. *but two Frenchmen, and sometimes none; as in the sixth, under* Julius III. *when* Henry II. *of* France *protested against that Council. And from* England *but one or two* (by your own Confession) *and those not sent by Authority. And the French* (he saith) *held off till the Cardinal of* Lorrain *was got to* Rome. *As for the Spaniards, they laboured for many things upon good grounds, but were most unworthily over born.* Now to this you have a double Answer ready, 1. *That Mission or Deputation, is not of absolute necessity, but only of Canonical Provision, when time or state of the Countreys whence Bishops are sent, will permit; in other Cases, it sufficeth, they be called by the Pope.* 2. *For those who were absent, the Impediment was not on the Councils part; and in the latter Sessions* (*wherein all that had been formerly defined by the Council, was* de Novo *confirmed and ratified by the unanimous consent of all the Prelates*) *'tis manifest, the Council was so full, that in the number of Bishops it exceeded some of the first four General Councils.* I begin with your first Answer, which necessarily implies, that a *General Council* is not so called by *Representation* of the *whole Church*, but by relation to the *Pope's Summons*. So that if the *Pope* make a *General Summons*, that must be called a *General Council*, though none be present but such whom the *Pope* shall think fit to call thither. But, Where do you find any such Account of a *General Council* in all *Antiquity*? I have given you Instances already of *General Councils*, in which the *Popes* had nothing at all to do with the summoning of them; nay, all the four *General Councils* were called by the *Emperour*, and not by the *Pope*, as any one may see, that doth not wilfully blind himself. The *Pope* sometimes did beseech and intreat the *Emperour* to call a *Council*, but never presumed to do it himself in those Days. And this is evident, not only from the *Historians*, but from the authentick *Acts* of the *Councils* themselves; and *Cardinal Perron*'s distinction of *the temporal and spiritual Call of Councils*, is as ill grounded as the *Pope's temporal and spiritual Power*; there being no Foundation at all in *Antiquity*, nor any reason in the thing, for two such several *Calls*, the one by the *Emperour*, and the other by the *Pope*. But this is a meer Evasion, the Evidence being so clear, as to the *Emperor's* calling those *Councils*, the *Nicene* by *Constantine*, the *Constantinopolitan* by *Theodosius*, the *Ephesine* by the *Junior Theodosius*, the *Chalcedonian* by *Martian* and *Valentinian*: And this is so clear, that *Bellarmine* in his *Recognitions* confesseth his mistake *about the Constantinopolitan Council being called by the Letters of Pope* Damasus; and acknowledges that to be true, which I at large proved before, *That the Synodical Epistle was not sent by the General Council, but by another the Year after.* If then the calling of *Councils* belongs not of right to the *Pope*, it is not his summoning which can make a *General Council*, without Mission and Deputation from those *Churches* whom they are to represent. And any other sense of a *General Council* is contrary to the sense of *Antiquity*, and is forced, and unreasonable in it self. For it must be either absolutely *general*, or by *representation*; none ever imagined yet an absolutely *General Council*, and therefore it must be so called as it doth *represent*; if so, then there is a necessity of such a *Deputation*. But here a *Question* might arise, Whether those *Deputies* of *Churches* have power by their own votes to oblige the Churches they are sent from, by convening in

§. 12. P. 216.

Ibid

Recognit. P. 46.

a general Council; or else only as they carry with them the sense of those Churches whom they represent; and this latter seems more agreeable to the Nature of a truly General Council, whose Acts must oblige the whole *Church*. For that can only be said to be the act of the whole *Church*, which is done by the *Bishops* delivering the *Sense* of all *particular Churches*; and it is not easie to understand, How the *Universal Church* can be obliged any other way; unless it be proved, that *General Councils* are instituted by some positive *Law of Christ*? so that what is done by the *Bishops* in them, must oblige the Catholick Church; and then we must find out not only the *Institution* it self, but the way and manner how *General Councils* should be called, of which the *Scripture* is wholly silent. And therefore there is no reason that there should be any other *General Council* imagined, but by such a *Representation*; and in order to this, the consent of all those Churches must be known by the particular *Bishops*, before they can concurr with others, so as to make a *General Council*. The most suitable way then to a *General Council*, is, that the *Summons* of them being published by the consent of Christian *Princes*, every *Prince* may call together a *National Synod*, in which the matters to be debated in the Council, are to be discussed, and the sense of that *Synod* fully declared, which those *Bishops* who are appointed by it to go to the General Council, are to carry with them, and there to declare the Sense of their particular Church, and what all these *Bishops* so assembled do all agree in, as the Sense of the whole Church, may be called the decree of a General Council. Or in case some great Impediment happen, that such *Bishops* cannot assemble from all Churches, but a very considerable number appearing and declaring themselves, which upon the first notice of it, is universally received by all particular Churches, that may *ex post-facto* be called a General Council; as it was with the first four *Oecumenical Councils*. And yet that in them there was such a *Deputation* as this is, appears by that *Expression* in the *Synodical Epistle* of the *Bishops* of *Constantinople* before mentioned; for in that they give this Account, Why they could not do what the *Western Bishops* desired, *because they brought not with them the consent of the Bishops, who remained at home to that Purpose.* Καὶ περὶ ταύτης μόνης τῆς συνόδου, τὴν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις μεινάντων ἐπισκόπων συγκατάθεσιν ἐπαγόμενοι. *And concerning this only Council,* viz. *at* Constantinople, *have we brought the consent of those Bishops which remain in the Provinces.* So that they looked on the Content of the other *Bishops*, to be necessary as well as their own. But now, if we examine your *Council* of *Trent* by this Rule, How far is it from any Appearance of a *General Council*? What *Bishops* were there sent from the most of *Christian Churches*? Those that did appear, What Equality and Proportion was there among them? For Voices in *General Councils* ought not to go by the number of *Bishops*, but by the number of *Churches*; so that if *six* were sent from the Church of *England*, or *France*, delivering the Sense of that Church they come from, they have equal *Votes* with the greatest number of *Italian Bishops*. But here lay the great Imposture of that *Council*; first, that the Councils being *general*, depended upon the *Pope's* general *Summons*, though never so few *Bishops* appeared; next, that the *Decrees* of the *Council* were to be carried by most *Voices*, and the *Bishops* to give their bare *placet*; these things being thus laid, when there was any fear that Businesses would not go right, it was but the *Legate's* using some Art in delaying it, and sending Intelligence to *Rome*, and forty *Bishops* are made together, and posted to *Trent*, to help out the number of Voices; and thus it was in the Case of the *Institution* and *Residence* of *Bishops*: And this is that you call, a

Tom. 1. *Concil. p.* 667.

general

general Council. 2. To your other, *That what was wanting in number at first, was made up at last when all former Decrees were confirmed by a full number of Bishops*; it is soon replyed, That this is, as all the rest of the Proceedings of that *Council* was, but a meer *Artifice*. For it appears by the *History* of that *Council*, that in the last *Session* under *Pius* IV. a Proposition was made, that all the *Decrees* under *Paul* and *Julius* should be approved; which was opposed, because they said it would be a derogation to the *Authority* of the *Council* of those times, if it should seem that the things then done had need of a new confirmation of the *Fathers*, and would shew, that this and that was not all one, because none can confirm his own things. But upon the *French Bishops* earnest insisting upon it, it was determined *simply to read them, and no more.* And, Do you call this a *confirming and ratifying them* de novo? So that, for all appears by this last *Session* the *Authority* of those *Decrees*, must, as far as concerns the *Council*, depend upon the number of the *Bishops* then present, which was but very small certainly for a *general Council*, there being not so many in most of the *Sessions*, as were in the *Donatists Council* in *Africa*; so far were they from the number of the ancient General Councils.

Hist. Council of *Trent. l.* 8. *p.* 804.

But here comes your grand Objection in the way, *That nothing is pretended by us against the Council of* Trent, *which might not have been in effect as justly objected by the Arrians against the Council of* Nice. But, Is not there easily discernible a vast Disparity between these two, which way soever we conceive them? The one called by the *Emperor*, who in Person sate in the *Council*, to prevent all Disorders and clancular Actions; the other by the *Pope*, who presided in it by his *Legates*, and ordered all things by his Directions. In that of *Nice*, the *Arrian Bishops* were as freely admitted to debate, as any of the other; but it was far from being so at the *Council* of *Trent*. In the *Nicene Council*, though *Alexander* was no further a Party as to the *Doctrine* than the other *Bishops* (no more was *Leo* at the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, or *Cyril* at *Ephesus*, though those are the three you instance in before) yet he sate not as *President* of the *Council*, but the *Emperour* had the chief Inspection for the right management of it, and for the *Conciliar* Actions *Hosius* was *President*: Would the *Pope* have been contented with such a *Council* in his Case, wherein the *Emperor* should have sate in chief, and some other Person besides the *Pope* to have *presided?* If not, never go about to parallel these two *Councils* with each other. Again, in the *Council* of *Nice*, all the *Bishops* came free, without any Pre-engagement to maintain the Party of *Alexander*; but the *Bishops* at *Trent* were all sworn to defend the *Papal Interest*. At *Nice*, the *Bishops* themselves debated the matters in *Controversie*; at *Trent*, the *Divines* dispute, the *Bishops* in their Formalities give their *Placet*. At *Nice*, every one was freely heard, none died for Grief of *Checks* being given them for their too free speaking, as there did at *Trent*. And these, I hope, shew, there was much greater Reason for the *Protestants* to except against the *Council* of *Trent*, than for the *Arrians* against the *Council* of *Nice*. And yet, besides all these Grounds of Disparity, those two remain good still, which his Lordship instanceth in, *viz. That the Council of* Nice *proceeded wholly by the Scripture, and that the Sentence of it hath been universally received by the Church, both before and after it*; neither of which can be said of the *Council* of *Trent*. But to these two you offer something by way of Answer. To the first, *That both these Councils had the Scripture for their Rule, but not their only Rule; for, you say,* Theodoret *expressly says, that in condemning the Arrian Heresie, the Council*

p. 13. Ibid. n. 4.

P. 230. n. 2.

P. 216.

P. 235 *Hist. l.* 1. *cap.* 8.

Council of Nice *grounded it self upon Tradition.* But *Theodoret* says no such thing; only out of an *Epistle* of *Athanasius*, he says, *When the Arrians objected that they used Words not contained in Scripture, they gave them this Answer, that so did they too; but the Words which they used, were such as their Fathers had used before them*; and, Do you call this the grounding the Condemnation of them upon *Tradition*? Yet, to do you right, I must suppose that either you took this upon trust, without searching *Theodoret*; or, if you did, you looked no further than *Christophorson's Translation*, which in things concerning the *Papal Controversies*, doth notoriously trip (to say no worse of it, as it were easie to manifest from several Examples) but we need no more than this at present. For whereas the Words in *Greek* run thus, Ἐξ ἀγράφων γὰρ ἀσεβήσαντες (ἄγραφα δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος, καὶ τὸ ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν) αἰτῶνται ἐπὶ ἐξ ἀγράφων μεθ' εὐσεβείας ἐννοουμένων λέξεων κατακεῖσθαι. Which *Sirmondus* faithfully renders, *Nam cùm ipsi ex verbis non-scriptis impietatem suam adstruxerint: (nusquam enim scriptum reperias Ex non extantibus; aut, Erat quando non erat;) accusant quod per voces non-scriptas, piè tamen excogitatas, condemnati sint, i. e.* Though the *Arrians* made use of unwritten Words themselves; yet they accused their Adversaries for condemning them by unwritten Words; meaning the ὁμοούσιον. But *Christophorson* translates αἰτῶνται, *afferunt* and there ends the Sentence, and then makes a new Sentence. *Quapropter ex non-scriptis vocibus, piè tamen excogitatis, condemnati sunt.* By this we see, What necessity there is of searching your Citations in *Antiquity*, which you deliver with so much Confidence, as though none had ever looked into the *Fathers* but your selves. But I find you so often tripping in your *Quotations*, that where *Bellarmine* hath been abused by the *Latin Interpreter*, you very securely follow him in it; as in another place mentioned in this Chapter, where *Christophorson* renders ἐκ τῶν πέρυσι γραμμάτων, *mandato literarum*, which *Bellarmine* confidently cites, as importing *Damasus his Power to summon the Council of* Constantinople, than which nothing can be further from the meaning of those Words. Thus you see, how vain your Attempt is, of proving that the *Council* of *Nice* grounded her Definition on *Tradition*, as the *Council* of *Trent* did, which is directly contrary to the Advice of *Constantine*, and the *Proceedings* of the *Council*, as his Lordship truly told you. To the second concerning the consent of the Church, you answer, *That the like consent of the Church both is, and was, when Protestants first began.* But, Will this reach to a *Parity*, if it were granted? For his Lordship speaks of the *Consent* of the *Church* in all Ages, from the *Primitive* and *Apostolical Times.* I pray, prove your *Mass*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Worship of Images*, *Purgatory*, &c. by such a *Consent* as this, and then you may say, There is no such Disparity between them: As to what you further add of the *Council* of *Nice*, condemning the *Quartodecimani* for *Hereticks*, I know not where you will find it, I am sure *Constantine* is far from saying so in his *Epistle* perswading to Union as to that matter. Cannot the *Council* of *Nice* appoint Time to celebrate *Easter*? Or determine, that those who come from *Hereticks*, shall not be *rebaptized*, but they must presently condemn all who do otherwise, for *Hereticks*? But you must be pardoned; you are proving a *Parity* between the *Council* of *Nice* and *Trent*, and you know you could not do that sufficiently, unless they condemned all Dissenters in any *Punctilio*, for *Hereticks*.

§. 14. P. 218. His Lordship further proves, *That* Trent *could be no indifferent Council to the Church, the Pope having made himself a strong Party in it; because there were more Italian Bishops there, than of all Christendom besides; yea more*

than

than double. For where the Number of Prelates is expreſſed that had Suffrage and Vote in that Council, the Italians are ſet down to be a hundred eighty ſeven, and all the reſt make but eighty three, ſo that there were more Italian Biſhops by a hundred and four, than of all the reſt of Chriſtendom; ſure (ſaith he) *the Pope did not mean to be over-reached in this Council. And whatſoever became of his Infallibility otherwiſe, he might this way be ſure to be Infallible in whatſoever he would have determined. And this without all doubt is all the Infallibility he hath.* To this you anſwer, *That the Pope's making a Party, is diſproved by the very Argument he brings to aſſert it,* viz. *the Multitude of Italian Prelates? for, Who knows not, that the Italians are more divided in point of Intereſt and Dependence, than in any other Nation of* Chriſtendom, *by Reaſon of the many Soveraign Principalities and States, into which* Italy *is divided?* But, What is this to the purpoſe, unleſs you could prove that the *Italian Prelates* were ſo divided in point of *Intereſt* and Dependence? Since therefore they have all their Dependence on the *Pope*, and not on thoſe *Principalities* in which they live; this Evaſion, though very ſlight, is yet the beſt your Cauſe would bear. And the greater you ſay, *the Number of Biſhopricks* is in *Italy*, the more Friends, I hope, the *Pope* muſt make by diſpoſing them; and, Could they do the *Pope* better Service, than to help him in this grand Buſineſs at *Trent*, wherein they ſought to outvy each other by promoting the *Pope's Intereſt?* But not only the *Proteſtants* complained of this, but the *Emperor* and other *Princes*, and all impartial Men in *Germany*, *France*? nay; and in ſome Parts of *Italy* too. But here his Lordſhip encounters an Objection of *Bellarmine*, viz. *that in the Council of* Nice *there were as few Biſhops of the Weſt preſent, as were of the Eaſt at* Trent, and manifeſtly ſhews the great Diſparity between the two *Councils*. 1. *Becauſe it is not a meer Diſparity in Number which he inſiſts on, but with it the Pope's Carriage, to be ſure of a major part; but neither the Greek Church in general, nor any Patriarch of the Eaſt, had any private Intereſt to look to, in the Council at* Nice. 2. *It was not ſo much a Diſparity between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, but that there were ſo many more Italians and Biſhops obnoxious to the Pope's Power, than of all* Germany, France, Spain, *and of all other Parts of the Weſt beſides.* 3. *Even in the Compariſon of thoſe two Councils, as to Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, there is this remarkable difference, that Pope* Sylveſter *with* 275. *Biſhops confirmed the Council at* Nice, *but the Council at* Trent *was never confirmed by any Council of Eaſtern Biſhops.* To the two firſt of theſe you Anſwer with your beſt Property, *Silence.* Only you would fain perſwade ſome ſilly People (if there be any ſo weak in the World that enquire into ſuch Things) *That the Pope had no private Intereſt at* Trent, *but what was common to him with other Biſhops.* You ſhould have done well to have commended the Excellency of an *implicite Faith*, before you had uttered a thing ſo contrary to the Senſe of the whole Chriſtian World. To the third you confeſs, *It is ſome Diſparity, but nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe if the Pope himſelf had ratified them, the Council would have had as much Authority as by that acceſſory Aſſembly.* The more to blame was the *Pope* a great deal, for putting ſo many *Biſhops* to ſo needleſs a Trouble. But you ſay further, *This Council was not held juſt at the ſame time.* But *Binius* tells you, it was held aſſoon as might be, after the Notice of what was done at *Nice*; ſhew us the like of the *Eaſtern Biſhops* at any time, and we will not quarrel with you, becauſe it was not at the ſame time: Though theſe Anſwers may paſs for want of better, they come not near your laſt, which

P. 236.

P. 220.

P. 237.

Tom. 1. *Conc.* P. 449.

which is a prodigious one, the Senſe of it being, *That the Doctrine of Faith defined by the Council of* Trent *was more univerſally received in the Church, than that of the Council of* Nice. *For that of* Trent, you ſay, *was*
Ibid. *univerſally received by the whole Catholick Church, and hath been more conſtantly held ever ſince; whereas many Provinces, either in whole or in part, deſerted the Faith defined at* Nice, *and embraced the* Arrian *Hereſie.* It ſeems then, the twelve good Articles of *Trent* have been more generally received by the *Catholick Church*, than the *eternal Exiſtence of the Son of God*; and conſequently, that you are more bound to believe the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, or *Tranſubſtantiation*, than that the *Son is of the ſame Subſtance with the Father:* For your Grounds of *Faith* being reſolved into the *Churches Infallibility*, you cannot believe that which hath been ſo much queſtioned in the *Church*, ſo firmly as that which hath been univerſally believed and conſtantly held. But the univerſal Reception of the *Doctrine* of the *Council* of *Trent* by the whole *Catholick Church*, is ſo intolerable a Falſhood, that you would ſcarce have vented it, unleſs it were your deſign to write for the *Whetſtone*.

To *A. C.*'s Objection, *That neither French, nor Spaniſh, nor Schiſmatical Greeks did agree with the Proteſtants in thoſe Points which were defined by*
P. 221. *the Council*, his Lordſhip anſwers, *That there can be no certainty, who did agree, and who not, (or who might have agreed before the Council ended) becauſe they were not admitted to a fair and free Diſpute. And it may be too, ſome Decrees would have been more favourable to them, had not the care of the Pope's Intereſt made them ſowrer.* Here you complain, *of his Lordſhip's falling again to his Surmiſes, of the Biſhops being over-awed by*
Ibid. n. 8. *the Pope's Authority in the Council*; which you call *an empty and injurious Suſpicion, an unworthy Accuſation, and arguing the want of Chriſtian Charity.* But uſually when you ſtorm the moſt, you are the moſt guilty. For if you call this an *empty Suſpicion*, &c. you charge many more with it beſides his Lordſhip, and thoſe, the greateſt of your own Communion; what meant elſe, the frequent *Proteſtations* of the *French* and *Spaniſh Ambaſſadors*, in which they often declared, that as things were managed, the *Council was not Free?* What meant thoſe Words of the
Hiſt. Council of *Trent*, *l.* 7. *p.* 683. *Emperor Ferdinand*, in his Letters to the *Legates* and the *Pope? That the Liberty of the Council was impeached chiefly by three Cauſes: one, becauſe every thing was firſt conſulted of at* Rome: *another, becauſe the Legates had aſſumed to themſelves only the Liberty of propoſing, which ought to be common to all: the third, becauſe of the Practices which ſome Prelates intereſted in the Greatneſs of the Court of* Rome *did make.* The *French Ambaſſadour, Monſieur de Lanſac* writ to the *King* his *Maſter, That the Pope was ſo much Maſter of this Council, that his Penſioners whatſoever the Emperors or we do remonſtrate to them, will do but what they liſt.* Several of the like Nature might eaſily be produced, ſo that it is not his Lordſhip only is guilty of this *want of Charity* (as you call it) but all impartial Perſons, who were moſt acquainted with the *Affairs* of that *Council*. Whoſe Judgment is certainly much more to be taken than ſuch who have ſworn to defend it. But you have an excellent Argument to prove the *Council Free, becauſe the Biſhops of the Council continued in the Faith and Doctrine of it as long as they lived.* And had they not good Reaſon to to do, when they were ſworn before-hand to defend the *Pope*, and having ſecured him from danger of Reformation by the *Council*, and ſubſcribed the Decrees of it, they were as much bound to defend their own Acts. And although it is well enough known what Practices,

ctices were uſed to bring off the *French* and *Spaniſh Biſhops*; yet when they were brought off, what a Shame would it have been for them to have revolted from their own *Subſcriptions*? But what is this to that General Freedom which was deſired by the *Roman Catholick Princes* for *Reformation* of the *Court of* Rome, and by *Proteſtants* both of the *Court* and *Church*? Was the *Council* any thing the more free, becauſe that Party which met there continued in what they had done? Juſt, as if a part of a *Common-Council* ſhould ſuffer only ſuch Perſons to come there whom they thought fit, and ſuffer nothing to be debated, but what two or three of the leading Men ſhould propound, and yet this be call'd a free *Common-Council*, becauſe they who were of it, did after they had done, perſiſt in it? And this is all you have to plead for the *Freedom* of the *Council* of *Trent*.

Touching the *Greek Church*, and the Writings of the *Patriarch Hieremias*, it is to little purpoſe, to ſay, *That they differ from us in ſeveral things*, unleſs you could prove, that they did agree with you in all. And if (as you ſay) *they do condemn Proteſtantiſm*, you cannot but know they do much more condemn *Popery*; and that in ſome of the main Articles of it. And therefore we have Reaſon to believe, that you more dread a *Free Council*, wherein the *Greek Churches* may be admitted to equal Votes with the *Latin*, than the *Proteſtants* do the Judgment of the *Greek Church*. For it is ſufficiently known, how much the *Greeks* agree with us in the Oppoſition to the great Points of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and the *Infallibility of the Church of* Rome; how far they are from the belief of *Purgatory* in your Senſe, and ſeveral other things which are contained in the Decrees of the *Council* of *Trent*: If the *Patriarch Hieremias* did not in all things agree with the *Lutheran Divines*, doth it thence follow, that he would ſubſcribe to the *Council* of *Trent*? But becauſe you pretend to give us a full Account of the Proceedings, between the *Patriarch Hieremias*, and the *Lutheran Divines*, we muſt a little further enquire into them. You tell us then, *That about the end of the laſt Century, ſome eminent Proteſtants of the Lutheran Party, endeavoured to feel the Pulſe of the Greek Church, to ſee if they could there find any Symptoms of their own Diſeaſe. The Deſign was* (you ſay) *to cloſe with the Greeks, for the better making out the pretended perpetual Succeſſion of their Church; which Project they ſo hotly purſued, though formerly in vain attempted, that they would not deſiſt till the Patriarch being ſettled in his Throne, they had ſent him the ſum of their reformed Belief, drawn up according to the Auguſtane Confeſſion. After a long entercourſe of Letters, Anſwers, and replies mutually continued for ſome Years, and all Arguments uſed that might induce the Patriarch to receive them into his Communion, he could not be courted to ſo much as the leaſt ſhew of approving their Doctrine: but did in all his Anſwers clearly confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church, which thoſe Lutherans endeavoured to overthrow. In ſo much, that the Patriarch tired with their Importunity, gave them a Rebuke for their Departure from the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and deſired them not to trouble him any more with their Writings.* A very formal Story! One would expect the next News ſhould have been, that the *Patriarch* had come to kiſs his *Holineſs's Feet*, or at leaſt ſubſcribed to the *Council* of *Trent*. But all your Stories out of the *Eaſt* have not ſo much *Truth* as *Formality* in them: witneſs one for all, that ſolemn *Legation* from *Gabriel Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, to *Pope Clement* 8, wherein an Acknowledgment was made of the *Pope's Supremacy* as *Head of the Church*; upon which, ſuch Joy was

P. 15.

P. 238.

conceived at *Rome*, that *Baronius* unmeasurably triumphs upon it, and says, it tends as much to the Joy of *Catholicks*, as to the Confusion of *Hereticks*; and therefore hath very solemnly published the *Legation* it self at the end of the sixth *Tome* of his *Annals*; but upon a further Examination of it, it was all found to be a meer Fiction and Imposture of one *Barton*, as both *Thuanus* and *Thomas à Jesu* confess. But we must suppose no such danger in this Story, for you tell us, *You have it from* Spondanus, *and he out of the Writings of those Protestants themselves*: but I much rather believe by the Circumstances of your Story, that either you, or *Spondanus*, had it from *Socolovius* their virulent Adversary, who having clancularly procured a *Copy* of the *Patriarch's* Answer, he publishes it in *Latin* with the Title of *Censura Orientalis Ecclesiæ*, and gives much the same account as you do here. In which there are two grand Mistakes, first, as to *the Design*, which you say, *was to be admitted into Communion with the Greek Church*: The second, as to the *Event*, which you say was, *That the Patriarch did not shew the least Approbation of their Doctrine, but did in all his Answers confirm the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church.* Both which, how notoriously false they are, will presently appear by a full Account of the Circumstances of this Affair. We must know then, that the News of the *Lutherans* appearing in *Germany* against the *Pope* being spread at *Constantinople*, great enquiry was made what their Doctrine was, and they were represented (by whose Arts one may easily guess) as Men holding strange Opinions, denying the *Divinity of Christ*, &c. as appears by a Letter lately published of a *Divine* about that time resident in *Constantinople*; and withal, that they were defamed generally as Persons of *no Religion at all*, and of *wicked and flagitious Lives*; upon this, those *German Divines* send by *Stephanus Gerlachius*, *Chaplain* to the *Emperor's Embassador*, a *Greek Copy* of the *Augustane Confession*, *Martinus Crusius* having before sent a Letter only of Respect to the *Patriarch Hieremias*; who by the means of *Cantacuzenus* was made *Patriarch* in the room of *Metrophanes*, who was then deposed. *Gerlachius*, as appears by a Letter of his dated *May* 24. *A.* 1575. carries the Copy of the *Augustane Confession* to the *Patriarch*, who then had his *Council* about him, which with great Joy and Delight, he saith, he read in the Presence of them, and delivered it to be read to the *Priests* and *Calogeri*; but five Points he selected out of it to be further discussed, and when afterwards he waited on the *Patriarch* to know his Judgment concerning it, *Johannes Zygomalas*, who was then the *Rhetor Patriarchicus*, a kind of *Chancellor* to him, told him, that having read it almost all over, they approved almost all, except that *about Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son*, and *unleavened Bread*; but he particularly desired the *Patriarch* to return an Answer to the *Divines*, who sent it with his Judgment upon it; and having spoken with the *Metropolitan* of *Nice* and others, they seemed very much pleased with that *Confession*. With the *Patriarch's* Letter *Johannes Zygomalas* writes to *Martin Crusius*, and therein tells him, that though in all things the *Patriarch* did not assent to them; yet it might be evident to all ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρωτεχέσεσι καὶ συνεκπωτέροις τῆς πίστεως συμφωνῶμεν, *that they did agree in the most important Articles of Christian Faith; and that in other things they might easily agree, if they left the new and strange Customs, and adhered to the Catholick Church with them*, and there was the greater hopes of it ἀδετέρων συμφωνόντων τῷ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης ἀρχιερεῖ, ὅτε τῇ καθ' αὐτὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἑκατέρων ἀπτομένων ταῖς κακαῖς αὐτῶν συνηθείαις καὶ παραχρήσεσιν, *Since neither part did agree with the Bishop of old* Rome, *or the Church which joins with him, but both oppose the evil*

Thuan. hist. l. 114. ad A. 1595.

Thom. à Jesu de Convers. omn. gent. l. 7. c. 6. p. 364.

Hottinger. Archaiolog. Orient. cap. 3. p. 69.

Apud Chytræ. de statu Eccl. Orient. p. 122.

evil Customs and Abuses which come by him: which bears the same Date with the *Patriarchs* first Answer to the *Tubing Divines*, May 15. 1576. And the *Patriarch* in his Letter *heartily wishes an Union and Conjunction between them.* From hence we may easily gather, how true both those Things were, *viz. That the intent of their Writing was, to be admitted into the Communion of the Greek Church, and that the Patriarch did not in the least approve their Doctrine, but confirmed the Tenets of the Roman Catholick Church.* But we must look further into the Writings themselves, to see how far they agreed, and wherein they differed. It appears then, that the *Patriarch* did profess his Consent with them in these Things, besides the Articles of the *Creed*, and the *Satisfaction of Christ*, and other more general Points, *viz. That the Sacrament was to be received in both kinds, that the use of Marriage was not to be absolutely forbidden the Clergy*, though their Custom is, that they must be married before they take Orders; besides the grand Articles of the Pope's *Supremacy*, and the *Roman Churches Infallibility*; Doth he that joyns with them in these Things not in the least approve their Doctrine, but confirm the *Tenets* of the *Roman Catholick Church*? But withal, it must be confessed, that besides that common Article of the *Procession of the Spirit*, wherein he disputes most earnestly; there are five others, in which they dissented from each other, *about Free-will, Justification by Faith, the Number of Sacraments, Invocation of Saints, and Monastick Life*, and about these the remaining Disputes were. In some of which it is easie to discern how far the right State of the Question was from being apprehended, which the *Lutheran Divines* perceiving sent him a larger and fuller Explication of their Mind in a *Body* of *Divinity* in *Greek*; but the *Patriarchs* troubles coming on, *Cantacuzenus* deposing him too, and other Businesses taking him off upon his *Restoration*, he breaks off the Conference between them. But although he differed from them in these Things, yet he was far enough from rebuking them for departing from the *Roman Church*, although he was desirous they should have joined with them in the Approbation of such Things as were in *use* among themselves. And in those Things in which he seems to plead for some Practices in *use* in the *Roman Church*, yet there are many considerable Circumstances about them, wherein they differ from the *Church* of *Rome*, as hath been manifested by many others. As in the Article of *Invocation of Saints*, the *Patriarch* saith, *They do not properly Invocate Saints but God, for neither* Peter *nor* Paul *do hear us*, upon which ground it is impossible to maintain the *Romish Doctrine* of *Invocation* of *Saints*. And in most of the other, the main Difference lies in the want of a true *State* of the *Questions* between them. But is this any such great matter of Admiration, that the *Patriarch* upon the first Sight of their *Confession* should declare his dissent from them in these things? It is well enough known, how much *Barbarism* had crept into the *Greek* Church after their being subdued by the *Turks*, the means of *Instruction* being taken from them, and it being very rare at that time to have any *Sermons* at all, in so much, that one of their *Calogeri* being more learned than the rest, and preaching there in *Lent*, was thereby under great Suspicion, and at last was by the *Patriarch* himself sent out of the way. It is therefore more to be wondered they should preserve so much of the Doctrine of Faith entire as they have done, than that any corrupt Practices should prevail amongst them. The most then, which you can make of the Judgment of the *Patriarch Hieremias*, is, that in some things he was opposite to the *Protestants*, as in others to the *Church* of *Rome*. But what would you have said, if any *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* had declared his Consent so fully with the *Church*

Primum Patriar. Resp. p. 149.

of *Rome*, as the *Patriarch Cyril* did afterwards with the *Proteſtants*? who on that account ſuffered ſo much by the Practices of the *Jeſuits*, of whom he complains in his Epiſtle to *Utenbogard*. And although a Faction was raiſed againſt him by *Parthenius* who ſucceeded him, yet another *Parthenius* ſucceeding him ſtood up in Vindication of him. Since therefore ſuch different Opinions have been among them about the preſent Controverſies of the Chriſtian World, and there being no declared Confeſſion of their *Faith* which is owned by the whole *Greek Church*, as to theſe things; there can be no confident pronouncing what their Judgment is, as to all our Differences, till they have further declared themſelves.

Epiſt. Remonſt. p. 412.

PART III.

Of Particular Controverſies.

CHAP. I.

Of the Infallibility of General Councils.

How far this tends to the ending Controverſies. Two diſtinct Queſtions concerning the Infallibility, and Authority of General Councils. The firſt entred upon, with the State of the Queſtion. That there can be no certainty of Faith that General Councils are infallible; nor that the particular Decrees of any of them are ſo: which are largely proved. Pighius *his Arguments againſt the Divine Inſtitution of General Councils. The Places of Scripture conſidered, which are brought for the Churches Infallibility, and that theſe cannot prove that General Councils are ſo;* Matth. 18. 20. Acts 15. 28. *particularly anſwered. The Senſe of the Fathers in their high Expreſſions of the decrees of Councils. No conſent of the Church as to their Infallibility. The place of St.* Auſtin *about the Amendment of former General Councils by latter, at large vindicated. No other places in St.* Auſtin *prove them infallible, but many to the contrary General Councils cannot be infallible in the Concluſion, if not in the uſe of the Means. No ſuch Infallibility, without as immediate a Revelation as the Prophets and Apoſtles had: taking Infallibility not for an abſolute unerring Power, but ſuch as comes by a Promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance preſerving from Error. No Obligation to internal Aſſent, but from immediate Divine Authority. Of the Conſiſtency of Faith and Reaſon in things propounded to be believed. The ſuitableneſs of the contrary Doctrine to the Romaniſts Principles.*

§. 1. IF high Pretences and large Promiſes were the only things, which we ought to value any *Church* for, there were none comparable to the *Church* of *Rome*. For there can be nothing imagined amiſs in the *Chriſtian World*, but, if we believe the Bills her *Factors* ſet up, ſhe hath an *Infallible Cure* for it. If any enquire into the Grounds of *Religion*, they tell us, That her Teſtimony only can give them *Infallible Certainty*; if any are afraid of miſtaking in Opinions, they have the only *Infallible Judge* of *Controverſies* to go to; if any complain of the Rents and Diviſions of the Chriſtian World, they have *Infalli-*

ble

ble Councils either to prevent or heal them. Who then would not run into the bosom of such a *Church* as this, with whom there is nothing but what is *Infallible*? Who but *Scepticks*, *Hereticks*, and *Schismaticks* would keep out of her Communion? For what is there, Men can desire more in a *Church* than she hath, where every thing is so *Infallible*? *Faith* is *Infallible*, *Tradition Infallible*, the *Church Infallible*, the *Pope Infallible*, *General Councils Infallible*, and what not? But who are there that more cheat and deceive the World, than those *Mountebanks*, who pretend to the most *Infallible Cures*? For, what is wanting in *Truth* and *Reality* must be helped out with the greater *Confidence*; and so we shall find it to be in these *Infallible Pretenders*, who fall short in nothing more than where they lay the highest Claim to *Infallibility*. Thus we have already manifested, that none have more weakened *Faith*, than such who have given out, that they only could make it *Infallibly certain*, none have brought more *Errors* than that *Church* which arrogates to her self, that she is *Infallible*; it now remains, that we discover that nothing is further from promoting the *Churches Peace*, than this present Pretence of the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*. For the ending of *Controversies* was the occasion of this Dispute; but this Dispute it self hath caused more. And will do so, as long as Men desire to see Reason for what they do. For it cannot be expected, that Men should yield their Judgments up to the Decrees of every such Combination of Men as shall call it self a *General Council*, unless it be evidently proved, that it is impossible they should err in those *Decrees*. Where there be no other ways found out for the ending some great *Controversies* of the *Church*, but by a free and *General Council*, all wise Men will value the *Churches Peace* so far as not to oppose the *Determinations* of it; it being the highest *Court* of *Appeal* which the *Church* hath. But there is a great deal of Difference between a Submission for Peace sake, in those Things which are not contrary to the *Fundamentals* of *Faith*, and the assent of the Mind to all the *Decrees* of such a *Council* as in themselves *Infallible*. For, supposing them subject to Error, yet if that Error be not such as doth over-weigh the *Peace* of the *Church*, the *Authority* of it may be so great as to bind Men to a Submission to them. But where they challenge an *internal Assent* by vertue of such *Decrees*, there must be first proved an *Impossibility* of *erring* in them, before any can look on themselves as obliged to give it. And while Men contend about this, that which was mainly aimed at, is lost by these Contentions, which is the *Unity* and *Peace* of the *Church*. For it is a most fond and unreasonable thing, to suppose, there may not be as great Divisions in the World, about the ways to end *Controversies* as any other. Nay it is apparent, that the greatest *Controversies* this Day in the Christian World are upon this Subject. It is not therefore any high challenge of *Infallibility* in any *Person* or *Council* which must put an end to *Controversies*; for nothing but *Truth* and *Reason* can ever do it, and the more Men pretend to unreasonable Ways of deciding them, instead of ending *one* they beget *many*. For the higher the Pretences are, the more all wise Men are apt to suspect them, and to require the more clear and pregnant Evidence for what they say; and if they fail in that, they have Reason to question their *Integrity* much more than if they had contented themselves with more moderate Claims. For it is not saying *Councils are Infallible*, will make Men yield the sooner to their Determinations, unless you first convince their Reason by proving that they are so. But if you aim at nothing but the *Churches Peace*, you might save your selves this labour; perswade Men to be *meek* and *humble*, *sober* and *rational*, and I dare promise you the *Church* shall be more at quiet, than if you could prove all the *Councils* in the World

to

to be *Infallible*. For, will that ever put a ſtop to the contentious *Spirits* of Men? Will that alter their Tempers, or make them delight in thoſe things which are contrary to them? No, you only offer to apply that *Phyſick* to the Foreheads of Men which ſhould be *taken inwards*; if you would endeavour to promote true *Piety* and a *Chriſtian Spirit* in the World, that would tend more to the *Church's Peace* than all your *Conteſts* about the *Infallibility* of *general Councils*. But ſince you are reſolved to *contend*, the Nature of my Task requires me to follow you, which I ſhall more cheerfully do, becauſe, in Pretence at leaſt, it is for *Peace ſake*.

This is then the firſt of thoſe particular Controverſies which this laſt part
P. 2. is deſigned for the handling of, and which in the Conſequence of it, brings in many of thoſe particular *Errors*, which we charge your *Church* with. In handling of which, I muſt (as I have hitherto done) confine my ſelf to thoſe *Lines* you have drawn for me to direct my Courſe by. Only in this firſt, to prevent that Confuſion and Tedioufneſs which your Diſcourſe is ſubject to, I find it neceſſary to alter the Method ſomewhat. For there being two diſtinct *Queſtions* treated of, *viz.* Whether *general Councils be Infallible?* And ſuppoſing them not *Infallible*, How far they are to be ſubmitted to? You have intermixed theſe two ſo together, that it will eaſily puzzle the Reader to ſee which of them it is you diſcourſe of. And although I muſt confeſs his Lordſhip hath gone before you in it, as his occaſion of entring into it required, yet now the Points coming to be more fully examined, it will be the moſt natural and eaſie Method to handle them apart, and to begin firſt with that of *Infallibility*; for the other ſuppoſing the denial of it, it ought to follow the Reaſons which are given for that Denial. But although I thus tranſpoſe your Method, I aſſure you it is not with an Intention to skip over any thing material, but I ſhall readily reſume the Debate of it in its proper Place. In your Entrance into this Diſpute, you give us very little hopes of any great Advantage is like to come by it, becauſe, upon your Principles, it is impoſſible we ſhould agree about the Requiſites to a *general Council*;
P. 222. for his Lordſhip wiſhing *that a lawful general Council were called to end Controverſies*, you preſently ſay, *A pure one to be ſure, if according to his Wiſh.* Yes, too pure a great deal for you, to be willing to be tryed by.
P. 240. And when his Lordſhip profeſſes, *That any general Council ſhall ſatisfie him, that is lawfully called, continued, and ended according to the ſame courſe, and under the ſame Conditions, with general Councils obſerved in the Primitive Church:* You ſay, *It is too general to be Ingenuous*; you mean, ſuch a *Council* would be too *general* for your Purpoſe; for, you are reſolved in your following Words, *not to yield to ſuch a Council wherein all excommunicate Biſhops, Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are not excluded*; which is, in ſhort, to tell us, You are reſolved to account none *general Councils*, but ſuch as are wholly of your own Party, in which the *Pope* ſhall ſit as *Judge*. Who are admitted, and Who not; though this be as contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, as it is to the practice of the *Primitive Church*, in thoſe *Councils* which were then called. In which I have already proved, that the *Pope* did not ſit as *Preſident*. And, as long as you hold to ſuch unreaſonable Conditions, it evidently appears, That your Diſcourſes of *general Councils*, are meerly *deluſory*; and, to uſe your own Words, *Such a general Council as you would have, is a meer nothing* (as to a General and Free Council), *an empty Name to amuſe ſilly People with*; for, you require ſuch Conditions in order to it, as are deſtructive both to the Freedom, and Being of a *general Council*. If therefore it be true, which you ſay, *That morally ſpeaking ſuch a general Council, as Proteſtants would have, is impoſſible to be had*; it is much more true, that

ſuch

ſuch a *general Council* as you would have, it is moſt unreaſonable we ſhould ſubmit to. For as long as you condemn all other *Biſhops*, but P. 214.
thoſe of your own *Church for Out-laws, and Deſerters of the Catholick Church*; and give no other reaſon for it, but becauſe you ſay ſo; we thereby ſee, How abſolutely averſe you are from any *Free Council*, and that without any ſhew of juſtice, you condemn all others but your ſelves, without ſuffering them to plead for themſelves in an *indifferent Council*, where both Parties may be equally heard. But it was wiſely ſaid of *Pope Clement* VII. that *general Councils are very dangerous, when the Pope's Authority is called in Queſtion*; and this you know well enough; for, if a *Free Council* were held, the *Pope* himſelf might be found with his Party to be the greateſt *Out-laws and Deſerters of the truly Catholick Church*. But in ſuch pack'd *Councils*, where the *Pope* ſits as *Preſident*, and orders all by his *Legates*, I ſhall deſire you once more to ruminate over your own Words; *What Rebel would ever be found criminal, if he might be allowed to be his own Judge*? But of ſuch a kind of *Council* as you would have, I have ſpoken ſufficiently in the precedent Chapter. That which we are now upon, is not the *Hypotheſis*, but the *Theſis*, in which we are to enquire, *Whether ſuch a General Council as you ſuppoſe, be Infallible or no*? His Lordſhip maintains the Negative, and you the Affirmative. Your Opinion then is, *That the Decrees of a general Council confirmed by the Pope, are Infallible, and that the holding of this, is a piece of Catholick Faith; and that it ſecures all the Members of the Church, from erring in any matter of Faith.* For you ſay, *It is not* de fide, *that the Pope without a Council is Infallible*; *but, that Pope and Council together are Infallible*, you all along above aſſert to be ſo; and *that the Decrees of general Councils fall nothing ſhort in point of certainty of the Scripture it ſelf; and that the contrary Opinion does actually expoſe and abandon all the adherents to it, to an unevitable Wavering and Uncertainty in Faith.* Theſe are your own Words, in ſeveral Places which I have laid together, the better to diſcern the *State* of the *Queſtion*. The main thing then whereon the uſe of *general Councils* depends being, *that this muſt be believed to be* de fide, *in order to the Certainty of Mens Faith, and Prevention of Errors*; that I may the better ſhew, how inſignificant all this Pretext of the *Infallibility* of *general Councils*, is, I ſhall firſt prove from your own Principles, that this cannot be *de fide*, and then examine the *Grounds* you inſiſt on for the Proof of their *Infallibility*.

I begin with the *Firſt*, which will ſufficiently demonſtrate, to how little §. 3.
Purpoſe you talk of this *Infallibility of Councils*, for preventing *uncertainty of Faith*, when you cannot have any *certainty of Faith* at all as to that Principle which muſt prevent it. For, ſuppoſing that really *general Councils are Infallible*; if you cannot give me any reaſons to believe that they are ſo, their Decrees can have no Power over my Underſtanding, to oblige me to aſſent to them. And ſince you ſay, this Principle muſt be held *de fide*, if there be no Foundation at all for ſuch an *Aſſent of Faith* to it, I muſt needs be *uncertain*, whatever the Decrees of thoſe *Councils* be upon your own Principles. If you require an aſſent to the *Decrees* of *Councils* as Infallible, there muſt be an antecedent Aſſent to this Propoſition, *That whatſoever Councils decree, is* Infallible: As I cannot aſſent to any thing as Infallible, which is contained in *Scripture*, unleſs I firſt aſſent to this, That the *Scripture it ſelf is* Infallible. If I therefore prove from your own Principles, that none can have an aſſent of *Faith* to this Propoſition, *That whatever general Councils decree, is* Infallible, then all your Diſcourſe comes to nothing, and men can have no more certainty by their Decrees, than if they were not Infallible. And this I ſhall prove by theſe things; 1. *That you can have no certainty of Faith*

(I muſt

(I muſt uſe your own Terms) *That the Decrees of general Councils in the general are* Infallible. 2. *That you can have no ſuch certainty as to the Decrees of any general Council in particular.*

1. *That you cannot in the general have any certainty of Faith as to the Infallibility of general Councils.* For, 1. What Infallible *Teſtimony* have you for this, without which, you ſay, No *certainty of Faith* is to be had? It is not enough for you to ſay, That the *Teſtimonies* of *Scripture* you produce, are an Infallible *Teſtimony* for it: For that were to make the *Scripture* the ſole *Judge* of this great *Controverſie*, which you deny to be the *ſole Judge* of any: And we muſt conſider this as a *preſent Controverſie*, which divides the *Church*, *Whether General Councils be* Infallible *or no*; In order to the ending which Controverſie, we deſire you to aſſign the way to it; for you tell us, you have the only Infallible *Way* of putting an end to *Controverſies*. Shew us therefore, which way this muſt be ended in the firſt Place? Not by *Scripture*, for that were to come wholly over to us; and if it may decide this Controverſie, it may as well all others. Who muſt then? The *Pope*. That cannot be, for we are not bound to believe him *Infallible*, but only with a *General Council*, as you tell us often. Muſt every one judge it by his *Reaſon*? No, this is the *private Spirit*, and would leave all to *Uncertainties*. What then muſt do it? The *Pope* and *Council* together? But that is it we are enquiring for, Whether we are to believe *Pope* and *Council*, or no: And then the Reaſon is, we muſt believe them, becauſe they ſay ſo. And, Can any thing be more ridiculous, than for you to deny that the *Scriptures* are to be believed for *themſelves*, and to aſſert, that the *Pope* and *Council* are to be believed for themſelves? If the *Pope* and *Council* then ſhould declare their *Decrees* Infallible, on what Account are we bound to believe them to be ſo? You have found out then an excellent Way for ending all other *Controverſies* that are ſo far to ſeek for ending this; which you cannot poſſibly do, without renouncing ſome of your Principles, or an apparent Contradiction. But beſides this, 2. Your very manner of aſſerting the Infallibility of *General Councils*, deſtroys all certainty of *Faith* concerning it. For, you ſay, That *Councils* are not *Infallible*, unleſs they *be confirmed by the Pope*: Which, to the Apprehenſion of any reaſonable man, is, *that they are not in and of themſelves* Infallible, but by virtue of the *Pope*'s Confirmation. And therefore to ſay that *Councils* are Infallible, and then make that *Infallibility* depend upon the *Pope's Confirmation*, is meerly delufory: For, you may as well ſay, that the *Pope* and *Provincial Councils* are Infallible. For, Doth the Decree receive any Infallibility from the *Council*, or not? If it doth, then the Decree is Infallible, whether the *Pope* confirm it or no: If it doth not, then the Infallibility is wholly in the *Pope*: And he may as well make a *Provincial Council* Infallible, as a *General*. But, ſuppoſe it be ſome Promiſe which helps the *Pope* in a *general Council*, which doth not in a leſſer (though there be no Reaſon for that, for he is *Head* of the *Church* in one as well as in the other) yet you cannot have any *certainty of Faith*, that the *Council* is Infallible. For, you ſay, The *Pope's* Confirmation is neceſſary to make it Infallible; but that the *Pope* may infallibly confirm the *Council* is no *matter of Faith*, and therefore the Infallibility of the *Council* can be none. For if the *Council's* Infallibility depend on the *Pope's* Confirmation, you can have no greater Certainty of the *Council's* Infallibility, than you have that the *Pope* will infallibly *confirm it*: But you can have no Certainty of *Faith*, that the *Pope* will infallibly confirm the *Council*; therefore neither can you have any of the *Council's* Infallibility. The

Aſſumption

Aſſumption depends upon this, that you acknowledge you can have no *certainty of Faith*, that the *Pope is* Infallible, but when he decrees in a *general Council, i.e. that the Decrees by Pope and Council, are* Infallible. But you can have no certainty, that the *Pope* in the Act of *confirming* them, *is* Infallible; for if ſo, you might aſſert it *de fide*, that the *Pope* without a *Council*, is Infallible. For his Act of *Confirmation* is diſtinct from *that* Infallibility which lies in the *Decrees*, which have paſſed both *Pope* and *Council*. So that if the Infallibility of *Councils* lies wholly in the *Pope's* Confirmation, and you can have no *certainty of Faith* of the *Pope's* Infallibility, you can have no certainty of Faith of *the* Infallibility *of general Councils*.

But, ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that you might in *general* be certain of *the* Infallibility *of general Councils*, when we come to inſtance in any one of them, you can have no *certainty* of *Faith*, as to the Infallibility of the *Decrees* of it. For you can have no ſuch Certainty, that this was a *lawful general Council*, that it *paſſed ſuch Decrees*, that *it proceeded lawfully* in paſſing them, and that *this is the certain Meaning of them*; and yet all theſe are neceſſary in order to the believing thoſe Decrees to be Infallible, with ſuch a Faith as you call Divine. §. 4.

1. *You can have no certainty of Faith, that this was a lawful General Council*; for that depends upon ſuch things which you cannot ſay are *de fide*, as, that the *Biſhops* in the *Council*, are *lawful Biſhops*, that the *Pope* who confirms them is *a lawful Pope*; for, by your own Explication afterwards of your *Doctrine, concerning the Intention of the Prieſt*, you ſay, it can be but *a moral certainty*, and that, you contend elſewhere, can be no ground for a *Divine Faith*. Beſides, you can have no more *certainty*, that is a *lawful* Council, whoſe *Decrees* you aſſent to, than you have, that thoſe *Biſhops* who are excluded, are *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*; but, Can you be certain of that with *Divine Faith*? and, Whereon is that *Faith* built?

2. You can have no ſuch kind of *certainty*, of what *Decrees* were paſſed by them, and whether thoſe *Decrees* were at all confirmed by the *Pope* or no? For *Bellarmine* confeſſeth, *No other certainty can be had of that, than that whereby we believe there were ſuch Perſons as* Cicero, *or* Julius Cæſar; *and condemns* Vega *for ſaying, The certainty of it depends upon the definitions of the Council it ſelf.* Now this at the beſt, being but a *humane* or *moral certainty*, you muſt contradict your ſelf, if you ſay, That a *Divine Faith* may be built upon it.

3. What Certainty can you have, that may be a ground for Faith, that the Council hath *proceeded* lawfully; for, in Caſe it doth not, your own Authors ſay, It may not be Infallible: For ſo *Bellarmine* anſwers in the Caſe of the Council of *Chalcedon, Concilium legitimum poſſe errare in his quæ non legitimè agit, that a lawful Council may err, in caſe it doth not proceed lawfully.* Now, Who can aſſure one, that there have been no *Practices* at all uſed to bring off ſome men to give their *Votes* with them? It is hard to conceive ſuch a Body of men, wherein ſome *few* do not ſway and govern all the reſt, and in that Caſe, Can any one ſay, that it was the *Spirit* of *God* which *governed* the Council? Eſpecially if one *Preſide* in the Council, who hath Authority and Power above all the reſt, and that others in the Council have any dependence on him; Who can then expect that Freedom which is requiſite to a *general Council*? The *Councils* of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, are condemned; becauſe, though there were a very great number of *Biſhops*, yet ſome out-witted all the reſt, and, by their Subtilty, brought them to ſubſcribe that Confeſſion of Faith, which *Pope Liberius* *De Concil. l. 2. c. 7.*

afterwards confirmed by his own *Subscription.* And if so great a *Council* as this, must be *reprobated* on that Account; Why not all others, where there are suspicions of the same Arts and Subtilties? Nay, How can a man be sure there have not been such Arts used in *Councils*? For it is not to be expected, that such things should be much known to the World, they being privately managed with the greatest Secrecy that may be. And yet it is in this case necessary to know, that the *Council* proceeded with all *Simplicity* and *Plainness*; for otherwise their *Determinations* may not be Infallible. In order to which nothing is more requisite than that there be no one, which hath any great *Authority* over them: For if the *second Council* of *Ephesus*, lawfully summoned, and the *Pope's Legates* being present, be therefore rejected, because *Dioscorus* the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* did *over-rule* the rest; What Assurance can we have of any fair Dealing, where the *Pope* himself *presides*, who hath more Ways both to terrifie and oblige, than ever *Dioscorus* could have? Besides, set aside this *over-awing* by some potent Person, suppose some active and subtil Men perceiving how things are like to go in a *Council*, use their Wits to bring off some men, not of so deep reach as others, to their own *Party*, and it may be by the *Accession* of a small number, they *over-vote* the rest; Must we presently say, That the *Spirit* of *God* went off with those few men to the other *Party*? For the *Decrees* of Councils going by *Votes*, and those *Votes* by the *major part*; Who doth not see, how easie it is (when it stands, it may be, upon a few Votes) to fetch off a number to the other side. And I do not know, where the *Spirit* of *God* hath promised, that where *three or four men* may so much alter the Decrees of a *General Council*, those *Decrees*, if they pass the *major part*, shall be *infallible*, and as *certain* as the *Scripture.* To be sure then, there ought to be great *Confidence* of the *Simplicity* of the *Councils* Proceedings where a man must *assent* to them as *Infallible*; and to that end Men must be assured that they came thither without any *Prejudice* upon their minds; that when they were there, they sought nothing but the *Truth* and the *Honour* of *Christ*; or else, to be sure, *they are not gathered in his Name*, and if not so, they cannot expect *he should be in the midst of them.* Now let any one who understands the World, and humane Nature, see if he can perswade himself, that a *Council* can have no *Prejudices* or *By-ends* upon them, that nothing of *Interest* and *Reputation*, may sway upon them when they are met there, that there shall be no *Heats* or *Contentions* among them; for if there be, let him then see, Whether he can believe them to be *Infallible*? If you say, *In a matter so highly concerning the Church, the Spirit of God will not suffer them to err*? You must first shew, where the *Spirit* of *God* hath promised this; and then, if you could, that those Promises do not suppose the Performance of some *Conditions*, which if they neglect, they may want the effect of them. In which Case, there can be no greater Assurance of the *Spirit's Presence*, than there is of Performance of the *Conditions*, which is the thing I now aim at. Besides all which, we have known, that when it hath been a Matter of as great Concernment to the *Church*, as any of those you can fansie, great Numbers of *Bishops* at *Sirmium*, *Seleucia*, *Ariminum*, *Ephesus*, have miscarried, and decreed that which hath been judged *Heresie* by the *Church*.

4. Suppose men could be assured of the Proceedings of the *Council*, yet what *certainty of Faith* can be had of the *meaning of those Decrees*? For we see they are as liable to many Interpretations as any other Writings. If the *Scriptures* cannot put an end to Controversies on that Account, how can *General Councils* do it? When their *Decrees* are as liable to a *private Sense*

Senſe and *wrong Interpretation* as the *Scriptures* are: Nay much more, for we have many other Places to compare, the help of *Original Tongues*, and the *conſent* of the *Primitive Church* to underſtand *Scriptures* by; when the *Decrees* of *Councils* are many times purpoſely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous Expreſſions to give Satisfaction to ſome diſſenting Parties then in the *Council*. Who knows not, what Diſputes have been raiſed about the Senſe of ſome of the *Decrees* of the *Council* of *Trent*? About which the ſeveral Parties neither are, nor are like to be, agreed. Nay, Who is ſo unacquainted with the Proceedings of that *Council*, as not to underſtand how much care was taken in many of the *Decrees* to paſs them in ſuch general Terms, that each Party might find their Senſe in them. How fearful were they of declaring themſelves, for fear of diſobliging a particular Party? And are theſe the Effects of an *Infallible Spirit*? Since we know it hath been thus in ſome *Councils*, Who dares venture his *Faith*, it hath not been ſo in others? Who dare be confident, this or that is the meaning of ſuch a *Decree*, when it may be capable of ſeveral Senſes? Was it a ſign, that *Council* was *Infallible*, that was afraid to ſpeak out in a caſe of great Conſequence and Neceſſity in the *Church*? the *Council* of *Trent*, I mean, in determining, *That due Honour be given to Images*, without aſſigning what that *due Honour* was, which was the moſt needful of all to be done. If the *Decrees* of *Councils* were not *ambiguous*, what mean ſo many *Diſputes* ſtill about them as are in the World? And when at laſt, you ſay, *That the Councils are Infallible when the Pope confirms them*, you ſay nothing more than if we ſhould ſay, *That Councils are Infallible when Scripture confirms them.* Nay, you ſay nothing near ſo much; for all are agreed, that *Scriptures are Infallible*, but many among your ſelves are far from believing, that the *Pope is Infallible.* And therefore we are much nearer ending Controverſies, in ſaying, *Councils confirmed by Scripture are Infallible*, than you are in ſaying, *Councils confirmed by the Pope are ſo.*

Theſe things being thus in the *General* premiſed, we come now to the particular handling this Controverſie between his Lordſhip and you. And for the greater clearneſs of proceeding, he premiſes ſome things by way of Conſideration; whereof the firſt is, *That all the Power an Oecumenical Council hath to determine, and all the Aſſiſtance it hath, not to err in that Determination, is all from the Univerſal Body of the Church, whoſe Repreſentative it is. For the Government of the Church being not Monarchical, but as Chriſt is Head, this Principle is inviolable in Nature; Every body collective, that repreſents, receives Power and Privileges, from the Body which is repreſented, elſe a Repreſentation might have force without the thing it repreſents; which cannot be. So, there is no power in the Council, no aſſiſtance to it, but what is in and to the Church.* But withal his Lordſhip adds, *That the Repreſentative Body cannot be ſo free from Error as the whole Church, becauſe in all ſuch aſſemblies many able and ſufficient Men being left out, they which are preſent may miſs or miſapply that Reaſon and Ground upon which the Determination is principally to reſt. By which means the repreſentative Body may err, whereas the repreſented, by virtue of thoſe Members which ſaw and knew the Ground, may hold the Principle inviolated.* All the Anſwer which you return to this, is, *That his Suppoſition of the Churches not being Monarchical, is confuted already*, (and I ſay, whatever you have produced is Anſwered already) *and that the Power and Aſſiſtance of General Councils cannot poſſibly be communicated to them by the Church, but muſt proceed from the ſame Fountain now, it did in the Apoſtles time*, viz. *the direction of the Holy Ghoſt; this ſpiritual Power not being of humane, but divine Inſtitution; and not proceeding ſo much from*

§. 5.

P. 228. *ſect.* 33.

P. 245.

the Abilities of the Perſons, as from the Co-operation of the Holy Spirit with them. To which I reply, that all this had need be more than thus barely aſſerted: it being confeſſed by your ſelves (as his Lordſhip ſhews) that a *General Council* is a *Repreſentative* of the *whole Church*, you ought to have ſhewed us the *Divine Inſtitution* of this *Repreſentative*, and the Promiſes made to it under that Notion, or elſe we may ſtill lay with his Lordſhip, That all the Power and Aſſiſtance it hath, is by virtue of that Body which it repreſents. But I need not in this urge the Arguments of *Proteſtants* againſt you; for in this, as in moſt other Controverſies, we have enough from thoſe of your own Party to oppoſe againſt theſe Affirmations of yours.

Hierarch. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 1. For *Albertus Pighius* not only aſſerts, but proves, that *General Councils are not of divine, but humane Inſtitution, ariſing from a Dictate of right Reaſon: that matters of doubt may be better debated by many prudent and experienced Perſons than by a few. So that as the ſupream Authority for Adminiſtration of Affairs belongs to one, ſo it is moſt agreable to right Reaſon, that Debates ſhould be by many.* This he proves at large, that nothing but *human Reaſon* is the Foundation of *Councils* in the *Church*; for, ſaith he, *In Scripturis Canonicis nullum de iis verbum eſt; nec ex Apoſtolorum inſtitutione, ſpeciale quicquam de illis accepit illa primitiva Chriſti Eccleſia. There is not a word of them in Scripture, neither did the primitive Church receive any particular Order from the Apoſtles concerning them:* which he from thence proves, becauſe in all the time of the *Primitive Church* till the *Nicene Council*, there is no mention at all of them. And at that time it did not receive any *new Revelation* concerning the celebrating *General Councils*, but the *Emperor Conſtantine's* Zeal for the Peace of the *Church* was the firſt Cauſe and Original of them. From whence he concludes, that they have no ſupernatural or divine *Inſtitution, ſed prorſus humanam, but altogether humane:* for they are, ſaith he, *The Invention of* Conſtantine *ſometimes uſeful, but not at all neceſſary.* This Man ſpeaks intelligibly, and not like thoſe who jumble *Pope and Council* together to make ſomething *Infallible* between them. For he ſays, *It is the better way by far to go immediately to the Apoſtolical See and conſult that, as the Infallible Oracle, in all Doubts of Faith.* And very honeſtly tells us, *That he believes* Conſtantine *was ignorant of that Privilege of the Holy See, when he firſt inſtituted General Councils.* Than which nothing could be ſpoken truer. If you have then nothing more to ſay for the *Divine Inſtitution* of *General Councils*, than what you have acquainted us with, it would be much more Wiſdom in you to contend with *Pighius* for the *Pope's Infallibility*, and let that of *General Councils* ſhift for it ſelf.

§. 6. His Lordſhip's ſecond Conſideration you admit of, *viz. That though the Act which is hammered out by many together, muſt needs be perfecter, than that which is but the Child of one Man's Sufficiency; yet this cannot be Infallible, unleſs it be from ſome ſpecial Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* Therefore omitting your very impertinent Addition to this Conſideration, *viz. So as to make its Decrees Infallible*, (which is the thing in Queſtion): We proceed to the third; which is, *That the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt is without Error,*

P. 230. *which (ſaith he) is no Queſtion; and as little that a Council hath it. But the doubt that troubles, is, whether all Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt be afforded in ſuch a high manner, as to cauſe all the Definitions of a Council in Matters fundamental in the Faith, and in remote Deductions from it, to be alike Infallible.* From this laſt Expreſſion you would very Subtilly infer contrary to his Lordſhip's Deſign, *That he granted General Councils to be Infallible in*

Ibid. *Deductions, as well as Fundamentals, but not to be alike Infallible:* whereas it is plain, his Lordſhip means no more by *alike Infallible*, than, Whether the Aſſiſtance

Aſſiſtance be *alike* in both to make them *Infallible*. And this you might eaſily perceive, but it would have prevented your Cavil about *a graduated Infallibility*; which I know none aſſert but your ſelf. This Conſideration brings on the main of the Battle, in thoſe *Texts* of *Scripture*, which are moſt inſiſted on to prove the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, viz. *John* 16. 13. *I will ſend you the Spirit of Truth, and he ſhall lead you into all Truth.* Joh 14. 16. *This Spirit ſhall abide with you for ever.* Matth. 28. 20. *Behold I am with you to the end of the World.* Matth. 16. 18. *The founding of the Church upon the Rock againſt which the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail.* Luke 22. 32. *Chriſt's Prayer for St.* Peter, *that his Faith ſhould not fail.* Matth. 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I will be in the midſt of them.* Acts 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us.* All which Places (except the two laſt) have been already examined as far as concerns any Promiſe of *Infallibility* in the Queſtions concerning the *Church's* and the *Pope's Infallibility:* and there being no Reaſon at all given, why any *Infallibility* at all is promiſed by them to the *Church* after the *Apoſtle's* times, it may ſeem wholly needleſs to beſtow a particular Conſideration again upon all of them. For it is evident in thoſe Places, all your drift and deſign, is only to prove a Promiſe of *Infallibility* in the *Church*, and to the *Councils* only by virtue of that. But having at large before ſhewed, that no ſuch thing can be inferred from theſe or any other Places, that which is built upon it, is wholly taken away too. For the only Pretence that you have, why *Councils* ſhould be proved hence Infallible, is, becauſe the *Church* hath *Infallibility* promiſed by theſe Texts, which muſt be very well proved, and much better than you have done, either here, or elſewhere, before the other can be deduced from hence. And yet ſuppoſing I ſhould grant, that *Infallibility* was promiſed to the *Church*, I ſee no ſuch neceſſary Conſequence from thence, that *General Councils* muſt be *Infallible:* unleſs you can prove from *Scripture*, that the *Infallibility* of the *Church* is meant of the *Church repreſentative* and not *diffuſive*; which is a new Task which you have not yet undertaken. For it is not enough to ſay, *That the Body of the Church is bound to believe and profeſs the Doctrine taught by the Repreſentative, and therefore the Repreſentative muſt be Infallible*, unleſs you could firſt prove, that there is a neceſſity of ſome continued Infallible teaching by the *Church Repreſentative:* which I deſpair of ever ſeeing done. I am ſo far therefore from thinking as you do, *That theſe Texts are ſufficiently clear in themſelves to prove the Infallibility of General Councils*, that I believe a *Philoſopher* might hear them repeated a hundred times over, without ever imagining any ſuch thing as a *General Council*, much leſs concluding thence, that they are Infallible. But becauſe you again cavil with another Expreſſion of his Lordſhips, in that he ſaith, *That no one of them doth infer, much leſs inforce Infallibility*; from whence you not *infer but enforce* this Conſequence, *that he was loth to ſay all of them together did not*; I ſhall therefore give you his Lordſhip's Anſwer from all of them together. Which is likewiſe ſufficient for every one of them. *And for all the Places together, ſaith he, weigh them with Indifferency, and either they ſpeak of the Church (including the Apoſtles) as all of them do: and then all grant the Voice of the Church is God's Voice Divine and Infallible. Or elſe they are general, unlimited, and appliable to private Aſſemblies as well as General Councils, which none grant to be Infallible, but ſome mad Enthuſiaſts. Or elſe they are limited, not ſimply to all Truth, but all neceſſary to Salvation; in which I ſhall eaſily grant a General Council cannot err ſuffering it ſelf to be led by this Spirit of Truth in Scripture, and not taking upon it to lead*

P. 254.

P. 246.

P. 239.

lead both the Scipture and the Spirit. For, ſuppoſe theſe Places or any other did promiſe Aſſiſtance even to Infallibility, yet they granted it not to every General Council, but to the Catholick body of the Church it ſelf, and if it be in the whole Church principally, then is it in a General Council but by conſequent, as the Council repreſents the whole. And that which belongs to a thing by conſequent, doth not otherwiſe, nor longer, belong unto it, than it conſents and cleaves to that, upon which it is a conſequent. And therefore a General Council hath not this Aſſiſtance, but as it keeps to the whole Church and Spouſe of Chriſt, whoſe it is to hear his Word and determine by it. And therefore if a General Council will go out of the Churches way, it may eaſily go without the Churches Truth. Which Words of his, contain ſo full an Anſwer to all theſe Places together, that till that be taken off, there is no Neceſſity at all to deſcend to the particular Places, eſpecially thoſe which are acknowleged by your ſelves to ſpeak primarily of the *Churches Infallibility.*

§. 7. Yet for your Satisfaction (more than any *intelligent Readers*) I ſhall add ſomewhat further, to ſhew the Impertinency of the former Places, and then conſider the force of the two laſt, which have not yet been handled.

1. *There can be nothing drawn from Promiſes made to the diffuſive Body, for the benefit of the Repreſentative, unleſs the Maker of thoſe Promiſes did inſtitute that Repreſentation.* Therefore, ſuppoſing that Infallibility were by theſe Promiſes beſtowed upon the *Catholick Church*, yet you cannot thence infer, that it belongs to a *General Council*, unleſs you prove that Chriſt did appoint a *General Council* to repreſent the *Church*, and in that *Repreſentation to be Infallible.* For this *Infallibility* coming meerly by *Promiſe*, it belongs only to thoſe to whom the *Promiſe* is made, and in that Capacity in which it is made to it. For, *Spiritual Gifts* are not bequeathable to *Heirs*, nor can be made over to *Aſſigns*; if the *Church* be promiſed *Infallibility*, ſhe cannot paſs away the Gift of it to her *Aſſigns* in a *General Council*, unleſs that Power of Devolution be contained in the *Original Grant.* For ſhe can give no more than is in her Power to beſtow; but this *Infallibility* being out of her diſpoſal, the utmoſt that can be given to a *General Council* is a power to *oblige* the *Church* by the *Acts* of it, which falls much ſhort of *Infallibility.* Beſides, this *Repreſentation* of the *Church* by a *General Council*, is a thing not ſo evident from whence it ſhould come, that from a *Promiſe* made to one it muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of the other. For, as *Pighius* ſays, *It cannot be demonſtrated from Theological Grounds, that a General Council which is ſo far from being the whole Church, that it is not a thouſandth part of it, ſhould repreſent the whole Church. For either*, ſaith he, *it hath this from Chriſt or from the Church; but they cannot produce one Tittle from Scripture, where Chriſt hath conveyed over the Power and Authority of the whole Church to a hundred or two hundred Biſhops. If they ſay, It is from the Church; there are two things to be ſhewed, firſt, that it is done; and ſecondly, that it is* de jure *or ought to be ſo done.* Firſt, it can never be ſhewed, that ſuch a thing ever was done by the *Univerſal Church*; for if it were, it muſt either be by ſome *formal Act* of the *Church* or by a *tacit conſent.* It could not be by any *formal Act* of the *Church*; For then there muſt be ſome ſuch Act of the *Univerſal Church*, preceding the being of any *General Council*; for by that Act they receive their Commiſſion to appear in behalf of the *Univerſal Church.* And this could not be done in a *General Council*, becauſe that is not pretended to be the *whole Church*, but only to *repreſent it*; and therefore it muſt have this Power to repreſent the *Church* by ſomething antecedent to its Being. Elſe it would only arrogate this Power to it ſelf without any Act of the *Church* in order to it. Now that the *Univerſal Church*

Hierarch. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 4.

did

did ever agree in any ſuch act, is utterly impoſſible to be demonſtrated, either that it could be, or that it was. Yet ſuch a *Delegation* to a *General Council* muſt be ſuppoſed in order to its *Repreſentation* of the whole *Church*; and this *delegation* muſt not only be before the firſt *General Council*, but, for all that I can ſee, before every one. For how can the *Church* by its act in one Age bind the *Church* in all Ages ſucceeding to the *Acts* of thoſe ſeveral *Councils* which ſhall be choſen afterwards? If it be ſaid, *That ſuch a formal Act is not neceſſary, but the tacit conſent of the whole Church is ſufficient for it:* then ſuch a Conſent of the *Church* muſt be made evident, by which, they did devolve over the Power of the whole *Church* to ſuch a *Repreſentative*. And all thoſe muſt conſent in that Act whoſe Power the *Council* pretends to have, and ſo it cannot be ſufficient to ſay, *That thoſe who chooſe Biſhops for the Council do it*; for then they could only *repreſent* thoſe who choſe them, and ſo their Authority will fall much ſhort of that of the whole *Church*. But ſuppoſe ſuch a thing were done by the whole *Church*, of which no Footſteps at all appear, we muſt further enquire by what *Right* or *Authority* this is done, for the Authority of the *Church* being given it by *Chriſt*, it cannot be given from it ſelf without his *Commiſſion* for doing it. Which if we ſtay till it can be produced in this caſe, we may ſtay long enough before we ſee any ſuch *Infallible Repreſentative* of the *Univerſal Church*. The utmoſt then, that can be ſuppoſed in this caſe, is, that the Parts of the *Church* may voluntarily conſent to accept of the *Decrees* of ſuch a *Council*; and by that voluntary *Act*, or by the *Supreme Authority* injoining it, ſuch *Decrees* may become Obligatory. But what is this to an *Infallibility* in the *Council*, becauſe it repreſents the whole *Church*? For neither is there Evidence enough for ſuch a *Repreſentation*, neither, if there were, could any Privilege of that Nature belong to the *Repreſentative Body*, becauſe of any Promiſe made to the *diffuſive Body* of the *Church*.

§. 8. 2. *What belongs to the Repreſentative Body of the Church by vertue of a Promiſe made to the diffuſive, can in no other Senſe be underſtood of the Repreſentative, than as it belongs to the Diffuſive.* Becauſe no further Right can be derived from any than they had themſelves. Therefore ſuppoſing a Promiſe of *Infallibility* made to the *Church*, it is neceſſary to know in what way and manner that *Promiſe* belongs to it; for in no other way and manner can it belong to the *Council* which repreſents it. If therefore the *Churches Infallibility* lies only in *Fundamentals*, the *Councils* Infallibility can extend no further. If the *Churches Infallibility* doth not imply, that all the *Church* or the *major Part* ſhould be Infallible, but that though the *major Part* err, yet all the *Church* ſhall not, then neither can it be true of a *General Council*, that all, or the *major Part* ſhould be *Infallible*, but only that there ſhould be no ſuch *General Council*, wherein all the *Biſhops* ſhould err. But then this is utterly deſtructive to the *Infallibility* of the Decrees of *General Councils*, for thoſe muſt paſs by the *major Part* of the *Votes*: Which *Canus*, one of the acuteſt of our Adverſaries, was ſenſible of, and grants, *that the major Part in a General Council may err, and the leſſer Part hold the Truth; but then*, he ſaith, *That the Pope is not bound to follow the major Part.* Which is expreſly to take away any pretext of *Infallibility* from the *Decrees* of the *Council*, and place it wholly in the *Pope*: And, Why may not then the *Pope* and a *Provincial Council* be as *Infallible*, as the *Pope* and the *leſſer Part* of *a General Council*? What then do the *Promiſes* of *Infallibility* to the *Council* ſignifie, if the *major Part* may definitively err? And therefore *Bellarmine* likes not this Anſwer, as being too plain and open, but gives another as deſtructive to the *Council's* Infallibility, as this is.

Canus loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 5.

Which

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 9. Which is, *that in case the major Part doth resist the better in a General Council, as in that of* Ariminum, *and the second at* Ephesus, *yet that it cannot conquer it.* How so? Doth it not conquer it when the *Decrees* are passed by the *major Part*? *No,* saith he, *for these Decrees are afterwards made void.* Very good: But then, I suppose in the *Council*, the *major Part* did conquer, although not after. But by whom are they made void? *By him to whom it belongs to confirm his Brethren*, saith *Bellarmine*. Well, but the Skill is, to know who that is in this case, who can reverse the *Decree* of the *Representative Body* of the *Church* under the Plea of *confirming his Brethren*? If it be the *Pope*, Who reversed the Decrees of the *Council* of *Sirmium*, to which the *Pope* subscribed? And for that of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, *Hilary* did more to reverse it, than ever the *Pope* did. Therefore others say, It is in the *Churches* Power to make void the Decrees of *General Councils*, as she did the Decrees of the *Arrian Councils*. If so, then we plainly see, the *Infallibility* doth not lie in the *representative*, but in the *diffusive Body* of the *Church* still; if that hath the Power to avoid and repeal the Decrees of *General Councils*. So that all the *Infallibility* of *Councils* is meerly *probationary*, and stands to the good-liking and consent of the *diffusive Body* of the *Church*. By which means the Decrees of a *Provincial Council* being accepted by the *Church*, are as *Infallible* as of a *General*. But in all these ways, there is no proper *Infallibility* at all in the *major Part* of a *General Council*, but it wholly lies either in the *Pope*, or in the *diffusive Body* of the *Church* still.

3. *If these Places which mention a Promise of Infallibility to the Church, must imply the Infallibility of General Councils, as the Churches Representative, then it will thence follow, that the Decrees of General Councils are Infallible, whether the Pope confirm them or no.* For the *Infallibility* is not promised at all *mediante Papâ*, but *virtute Ecclesiæ*; for if they be *Infallible* as representing the *Church*, they are *Infallible*, whether there be any *Pope* or no: for the *Pope* doth not make them more represent the *Church* than they did before. And this is very well understood and proved by those, who from these *Promises* to the *Church*, and from that Infallibility consequent upon it (by their Adversaries Confession) to a *General Council*, do infer the *Councils* Authority to be above the *Pope's*. Which is a just and necessary Consequence from this Assertion, That the Privileges of the *Universal Church*, are by vertue of its *Representation* in a *General Council*. Which Doctrine was asserted by the *Councils* of *Constance*, and *Basil*, and by the *Sorbonne Doctors*, till their being *Jesuited* of late. Who have therefore asserted, that it might be as lawful to call in question the Decrees of the *Council* of *Trent*, as of those *two Councils*. And whereas their Adversaries object, That this is not *de fide*; they answer, It is impossible but that it should be *de fide*, since it is decreed by *General Councils*. For, say they, were the *Fathers* at *Constance* and *Basil*, acted by any other *Spirit*, than *those* at *Nicæa*, and *Ephesus*? Why may not then the *Council* of *Trent* be opposed as well as them? For if there be any Difference, they had much the Advantage. In the *Council* of *Constance* (say they) two *Popes* were present, all the *Cardinals*, two *Patriarchs* of *Constantinople*, and *Antioch*, and the *Emperor* himself, and the *Legates* of all Christian Princes; and besides all this, it was confirmed by *Pope Martin*, and the *Acts* of *Confirmation* extant in the 45th *Session*. And so the *Council* of *Basil* was begun, according to the Decrees of the *Councils* of *Constance* and *Pisa*, and by vertue of the *Bulls* of *Martin* and *Eugenius*; and the *Popes Legates* were Presidents in it. So that if *General Councils* be *Infallible*, it must be *de fide Catholicâ*, that their Authority is above the *Pope's*:

And

And if so, their Infallibility cannot depend upon his Confirmation. Now, if we search into the Grounds on which they build this Power of *General Councils* independently on the *Pope*, we shall find they derive it wholly from those Places of *Stripture*, which speak so much concerning the *Church* and *Councils*, as is agreed on both sides. And therefore *Æneas Sylvius* (afterwards *Pius* 2.) says, *That is not the less* de fide, *because it is contradicted by some, since it is founded on the Promises of Christ concerning the Church.* Since therefore the *Pope* himself is but *Filius Ecclesiæ*, and the *Church* is *Sponsa Christi*; they say, It is unreasonable that the *Son* of the *Church* should not be subject to the *Spouse* of *Christ*. If therefore these Promises concerning the *Church*, infer an *Infallibility* in it, and that *Infallibility* be in a *General Council*, as *representing* the *Church*; it follows thence, that *Councils* must be in themselves *Infallible*, whether *confirmed* by the *Pope* or no. And we may see, how little this Opinion of *Infallibility* of *General Councils* is like to stand between them, by the Answers which are given by those of the other Party, who make the *Pope's* Confirmation necessary to the *Infallibility* of the *Council*. For *Canus* expresly saith, *That the Council is said to be Infallible in no other Sense than the Church is*, i. e. *in those Things wherein all agreed, and not the major Part. Bellarmine* likes not this; *For*, saith he, *if the major Part of the Council err, the Council must of necessity err? for that which properly belongs to the Council, is, Passing Judgment in matter of Faith, or making Decrees: now, if that were not the lawful Decree of the Council, which is made by the major Part, there never could be a lawful Decree, for none passes without some dissenting: and therefore he denies that the Council doth fully represent the Church without the Pope.* So that on both sides we see, how pregnant these Proofs are for the *Council's Infallibility*, when one saith, That if they be understood of the *Church*, the *Councils Infallibility* doth not want the *Pope's* Confirmation, the other to make the *Pope's Confirmation* necessary, denies such an absolute *Representation* of the *Church* in the *Council*. If then the *Council* doth represent the *Church*, it is *Infallible*, although not *confirmed by the Pope*, if it doth not, then the *Promises* made to the *Church* cannot belong to the *General Council*. Thus I have shewed you, how far these Places concerning (as you say) the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, are, from proving the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*.

Æneus Sylv. de gest. Concil. Basil. l. 1.

De Concil. l. 2. *c.* 11.

§. 9. But, though these general Places concerning the *Church*, may not so clearly prove the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, yet, you say, *There are some particular Places to this purpose. Which are*, Mat. 18. 20. *and* Act. 15. 28. Which not having been handled already, I must follow you more closely in the Examination of them. The first place is, *Mat.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* The Substance of the Argument from this Place, his Lordship thus repeats from *Bellarmin. The strength of the Argument is not taken from these Words alone, but as they are continued with the former, and that the Argument is drawn* à minori ad majus, *from the less to the greater, thus. If two or three gathered in my Name do always obtain that which they ask at God's hands*, viz. *Wisdom and Knowledge of those things which are necessary for them: How much more shall all the Bishops gathered together in Council, always obtain Wisdom and Knowledge, to judge those Things, which belong to the Direction of the whole Church?* To which his Lordship answers, *That there is very little Strength in these Words, either considered alone, being generally interpreted by the Fathers, of consent in Prayer, or with the Argument* à minori ad majus, 1. *Because, though that Argument hold in natural or necessary Things, yet not in voluntary or promised Things, or Things which depend upon their Institution.* 2. *Because it follows not, but where, and so far*

P. 234.

as, the thing upon which the Argument is founded, agrees to the leſs: Now this Infallibility doth not belong to the leſſer Congregation, and therefore cannot be inferred as to the greater. 3. *Becauſe it depends upon Conditions here ſuppoſed of being gathered together in the name of Chriſt, and therefore ſuppoſing Infallibility promiſed, theſe Conditions here implyed muſt be known before ſuch a Congregation can be known to be Infallible.* 4. *Becauſe Chriſt's promiſe of Preſence in the midſt of them, is only to grant, what he ſhall find to be fit for them, not infallibly whatſoever they ſhall think fit to ask for themſelves.* 5. *Becauſe* Gregory de Valentiâ *and* Stapleton *confeſs, that this Place doth not properly belong to prove an infallible certainty of any Sentence in which more agree in the name of Chriſt, but to the efficacy of conſent for obtaining that which more ſhall pray for in the name of Chriſt, if at leaſt that be for their Souls health. For elſe it would hence follow, that not only the definition of a general Council, but even of a Provincial; nay, of two or three Biſhops gathered together, is valid, and that without the Pope's conſent.* The utmoſt I can make of your Reply
P. 251, 252. to theſe Anſwers, lies in this, *That you grant that primarily and directly our Saviour doth not intend that particular Infallibility- and this is that which* Gregory *and* Stapleton *aſſert; but only that he ſignified in general, that he would be preſent with his Church, and all faithful People gathered together in his name, ſo often, and ſo far, as their neceſſities required his preſence, they duly imploring it. But yet the Argument holds for the Infallibility of general Councils, and not National or Provincial, becauſe the neceſſities of the Church require one, and not the other: and that it will follow* à minori ad majus; *in things promiſed, as well as natural, where the motive is increaſed, and neither goodneſs nor power wanting in the promiſer.* But all this depends on a falſe Suppoſition, *viz.* that there is a neceſſity of *Infallibility* to continue in the *Church*, and that all Perſons are bound to believe the *Decrees* of the *Councils* to be the *Infallible Oracles* of Truth; but we ſay, neither of theſe are neceſſary in the *Church*, and therefore you have no ground to extend this Promiſe of *Chriſt's* Preſence to the *Infallibility of Councils.* For you are not to extend the *Power* and *Goodneſs* of Chriſt as far as you ſhall judge fitting, but as far only as he hath *promiſed* to extend it. For otherwiſe it would be far more for the Peace and Unity of the Church, if every particular Congregation had this Infallibility, than if only *General Councils* had it: Becauſe by that means, many diſputes about the *Authority*, *Calling*, and *Proceedings* of *General Councils* would be prevented: Nay, it might be extended much further, for by this Argument from the *Goodneſs* and *Power* of *Chriſt*, you might, for all that I can ſee, inferr with more force, that every true *Chriſtian* ſhould be *Infallible*, and ſo there be no need of any *Councils* at all. For, whatever Argument you can produce, why *Chriſt's Goodneſs* ſhould extend to make *Councils Infallible*, it will much more hold as to the other; for the Peace, and Unity of the *Church* would be far better ſecured this way. If you ſay that Experience ſhews, *Chriſt never intended this by the Errors of particular Men in all Ages:* To the ſame Purpoſe we anſwer you as to *Councils*, that large Experience ſhews, that when *Biſhops* have ſolemnly met in *Council*, they have been groſly deceived; as you confeſs in all the *Arrian Councils.* If your Argument would have ever held from the *Power* and *Goodneſs* of *Chriſt*; Would it not have held at that time, when ſo great a matter of *Faith* was under debate? If *Chriſt* therefore ſuffered ſo many *Biſhops* ſo groſly to err, in a matter of ſuch Importance, wherein the *Church* was ſo highly concerned, How can you inferr from his *power* and *goodneſs*, that he will never ſuffer *general Councils* to err? If you anſwer, *That theſe erred for not obſerving the Conditions requiſite in order to Chriſts hearing them*, viz. *that they were not met in the name of Chriſt,*

did

did not come without Prejudice, nor rely on Divine Assistance. I pray take the same Answer as to all other *Councils*, that we cannot know that *Christ* heals them, or that they are Infallible, till we are assured of their Performance of the *Conditions* requisite in order to that *Infallibility*. And when you can assure us, that such a *Council* met together in the Name of Christ, and came meerly with a desire to find out *Truth*, and relied wholly on his Assistance for it, we do not so much distrust the *Power* and *Goodness* of *Christ*, as to think he will suffer them to be deceived. For we know upon those *Conditions* he will not suffer any good Man to err, much less an *Assembly* of them met in a *General Council*. But here you have the hardest Task of all lying upon you, which is, to prove that a *General Council* hath observed all these *Conditions*, without which nothing can be inferred from this Place, as to *Christ's* being in any Sense *in the midst of them.*

The last place mentioned for the Infallibility of *General Councils*, is that, Act. 15. 28. *Where the Apostles say of themselves, and the Council held by them; It seems good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* *And*, saith his Lordship, *they might well say it. For they had infallibly the Assistance of the Holy Ghost, and kept close to his Direction. But there is a great deal of difference between them and succeeding Councils, who never arrogated this to their Definitions, though they presumed of the Assistance of the Holy Ghost; and though that Form might be used, yet they did not assume such an Infallibility to themselves, as the Apostles had. And therefore it is little less than Blasphemy in* Stapleton, *to say, That the Decrees of Councils are the very Oracles of the Holy Ghost. And, that all Councils are not so Infallible, as was this of the Apostles, nor the Causes handled in them, as there they were, is manifest by the ingenouus confession of* Ferus *to that purpose.* This is the Substance of his Lordship's Answer to this Place. Which you think to take off by saying, *That there's no essential difference between the certainty of the things determined by the Apostles, and those decided by a General Council, confirmed by the Roman Bishop: and though after Councils use not the same Expression in Terms, yet they do it in effect, by enjoining the Belief of their Decisions under the Pain of Anathema.* If this be the meaning of the *Anathema*'s of *Councils*, there had need indeed be no great difference between the *Apostles Decrees*, and theirs. But this had need be very well proved; and so it is by you; for you produce *several Expressions of* Cyril, Athanasius, Austin, Leo, Gregory, *and some others* (out of *Bellarmin*) *in which they magnifie the Decrees of General Councils, calling them a Divine Oracle, a Sentence inspired by the Holy Ghost, not to be retracted*, and some others to the same purpose, *by which you vindicate* Stapleton, *and tell us, he said no more than the Fathers had done before him.* Yet all this is far from any Vindication of *Stapleton*, or proving your Assertion as to the equal Certainty of the Decrees of *Councils*, and of the *Apostles*. For the ground of all those Expressions, and several others of the same Nature, was not the Supposition of any *inherent Infallibility* in the Decrees of *General Councils*, but their great Assurance of the Truth of that *Doctrine*, which was determined by those first *General Councils*. For although I am far enough from believing the *Council* of *Trent* Infallible, yet if that had determined the same Points of *Faith*, which were determined in the first *four General Councils*, and nothing else; I might have said, *That the Decrees of that Council was a Holy and Divine Oracle, a Sentence inspired by the Holy Ghost, &c.* not that I thought the *Council* in the least *Infallible*, in determining these Things; but that they were of themselves *Divine Truths*, which the *Council* determined. And in this Sense *Athanasius* might well term the Definition of the *Nicene Council* against *Arius*, *the Word of our Lord which endureth for ever*; and *Constantine*

Q. 10. P. 237. P. 253.

ſtile it a *cœleſtial mandate*; and *Gregory might reverence the four Councils, as the four Goſpels* (though *Bellarmin* tells you, that Expreſſion muſt be taken in a qualified Senſe) yet all theſe, and any other of a like Nature, I ſay, import no more than that they were fully aſſured, the matters decreed by them, were revealed by *God* in his Word, and not that they believed that they became ſuch holy and divine Oracles, meerly by the *Council's Definition.* For the contrary might be abundantly manifeſted by many Expreſſions in them quite to another purpoſe: and if, inſtead of all the reſt, you will but read *Athanaſius* and *Hilary* concerning *Councils*, you will find your ſelf ſtrangely deceived, if you believe they ever thought them
P. 254. *Infallible.* What you add afterwards, *that it is ſufficient that there be a real Infallibility, though not like to that of the Apoſtles*, will not be ſufficient for me, till you can ſhew me the Degrees of *Infallibility*; for, I will promiſe you, if you can once prove that *Councils are really Infallible*, I ſhall not ſtick to ſay, That they are *alike Infallible* with the *Apoſtles.* As for *your diſcarding* Ferus *as a prohibited Author*, it only ſhews the great Integrity of the Man, who ſpoke too much Truth to be born by the tender *Ears* of the *Roman Inquiſition.*

Before I had proceeded any further, I had thought (becauſe of a former
P. 249. Promiſe) to have looked back to the place, where you *ſpeak* in Vindication of the *decretal Epiſtles*; but becauſe you only refer to *Turrianus* his Defence of them, I ſhall only return you an equal Courteſie, and refer you to the abundantly ſufficient Anſwer to him by *David Blondel.* One would have thought you ſhould have been aſhamed of ſo notorious an Impoſture as thoſe *decretal Epiſtles* are; but we ſee, what Shifts a bad Cauſe puts you upon, that ſuch Men as *Ferus*, *Caſſander*, *Eraſmus*, are under an *Index Expurgatorius*, but the *decretal Epiſtles* muſt be ſtill juſtified; but he that doth not ſee the Reaſons of theſe Proceedings, wants a greater *Index Expurgatorius* for his *Brains*, than ever they did for their *Books.*

§. 11. We return therefore to our preſent Subject, and having manifeſted, how far the Infallibility of *General Councils* is from being grounded *on the Veracity of divine Promiſes*, as you pretend without Ground; we now proceed to the Conſent of the *Church*, as to this Subject; which his Lordſhip ſpeaks
P. 240. to in the next Conſideration. Which is, *That all agree that the Church in general can never err from the Faith neceſſary to Salvation; but there is not the like conſent that General Councils cannot err.* Whether *Waldenſis* aſſerting, that *General Councils may err*, ſpeak of ſuch *Councils* as are accounted *unlawful* or no, is not much material; ſince, as his Lordſhip ſays, *The Fathers having to do with ſo many Hereticks, and ſo many of them oppoſing Church Authority, did never in the Condemnation of thoſe Hereticks utter this Propoſition, That a General Council cannot err. And ſuppoſing that no General Council had erred in any matter of Moment to this Day, which will not be found true, yet this would not have followed, that it is therefore Infallible and cannot err.* And to ſhew that St. *Auguſtin* puts a manifeſt difference between the Rules of *Scripture* and the *Definitions* of Men, he produceth that noted Place in him, wherein he ſo fully aſſerts the Prerogative of *Scripture* above all the Writings of Men, or Definitions of *Councils*: Which, becauſe it will be often referr'd to, I have cited at large in the Margin, but his Lordſhip gives the ſum of it in theſe Words. *That whatſoever is found written in Scripture, may neither be doubted nor diſputed, whether it be true or right. But the Letters of Biſhops may not only be diſputed, but corrected by Biſhops that are more learned and wiſe than they, or by National Councils; and*

Quis autem neſciat ſanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam veteris quam novi Teſtamenti certis ſuis terminis contineri, eamq; omnibus poſterioribus Epiſcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari & diſceptari non poſſit, utrum verum, vel utrum rectum ſit, quicquid in ea ſcriptum eſſe conſtiterit? Epiſcoporum autem literas quæ poſt confir-

National

National Councils, by Plenary or General. And even Plenary Councils themſelves may be amended, the former by the latter. From whence he inferrs, *That it ſeems it was no news with St.* Auſtin, *that a general Council might err, and therefore be inferiour to the Scripture, which may neither be doubted nor diſputed, where it affirms. And if it be ſo with the definition of a Council too, where is then the Scriptures Prerogative?* But his Lordſhip adds, *That there is much ſhifting about this Place, but it cannot be wraſtled off.* And therefore undertakes punctually to anſwer all the *evaſions* of *Stapleton* and *Bellarmine*, who have taken moſt Pains about it. But before you come to particular Anſwers, you are reſolved to make your way through them, by a more deſperate Attempt: which is, to prove that it cannot be St. *Auſtin*'s Meaning in this Place, that *general Councils may err in their Definitions of Faith, becauſe then S.* Auſtin *muſt contradict himſelf, becauſe he delivers the contrary in other Places.* This is indeed to the Purpoſe, if you go through with your Undertaking; but we muſt examine the Places: The firſt is *l. 1. c. 7. de Baptiſm. c. Donatiſt.* where you ſay, he expreſly teacheth, *That no doubt ought to be made of what is by full Decree eſtabliſhed in a general Council.* But here a great doubt may juſtly be made, Whether ever you ſearched this Place or no; for if you had, you would have had little Heart to produce it to this Purpoſe. For St. *Auguſtin* is there giving an Account, why he would not inſiſt upon any *humane Authorities*, but bring certain Evidence out of *Scripture* for what he ſaid; and the Reaſon he gives for it, is, becauſe in the former times of the *Church* before the *Schiſm* of *Donatus* brake forth, the *Biſhops* and *particular Councils* did differ from each other about the Queſtion in hand, *viz. Rebaptizing Hereticks*, until that by a *General Council* of the *whole World*, that which was moſt ſoundly held *etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur, was confirmed the Diſputes being taken away.* The utmoſt that can be drawn hence, is, that when this Controverſie was decided by a *General Council*, the Diſputes were ended among the *Catholick Biſhops.* But by what Arts can you hence draw, that S. *Auſtin* thought the *Council Infallible* in its *Definitions?* When the Buſineſs came to be argued in a *free Council* by the diſſenting Parties, and they more fully underſtood each other, and agreed upon one Sentence, S. *Auſtin* ſays the former Doubts were taken off: that is, the Reaſons and *Scriptures* produced on the other ſide ſatisfied them: but he doth not ſay, that no doubt is to be made of what is by full Decree eſtabliſhed in a *general Council*; but, that no *Doubts were made after it.* But if you ſay, *There could be no Agreement unleſs the Councils definition were ſuppoſed Infallible*, you ſpeak that which is contrary to the Senſe and Experience of the World; and even of that *general Council* where this *Decree* is ſuppoſed by *Bellarmine* to be made, *viz. the Council of Nice.* For, Will you ſay the *Council* was Infallible in deciding the time of *keeping Eaſter*, becauſe after that *Council* the *Aſian Biſhops* ſubmitted to the Cuſtom of other *Churches*? Is there no way imaginable to convince men, but by *Infallibility?* If there be, their *Doubts* may be taken away by a *general Council*, and yet that *Council* not be ſuppoſed *Infallible.* For if S. *Auguſtin* had meant ſo, nothing had been more pertinent than to have inſiſted on the Decree of that *Council*; and yet he there leaves it, and calls all Arguments of that nature *humane Arguments*, and therefore ſaith, *ex Evangelio profero certa documenta; I bring certain Evidences out of the Goſpel.* Which Words doubtleſs he would never have

matum Canonem vel ſcriptæ ſunt vel ſcribuntur, & per ſermonem forte ſapientiorem, cujuſlibet in eâ re peritioris, & per aliorum Epiſcoporum graviorem autoritatem, doctiorumq; prudentiam, & per Concilia licere reprehendi, ſi quid in eis forte à veritate deviatum eſt. Et ipſa Concilia quæ per ſingulas regiones vel provincias fiunt plenariorum Conciliorum autoritati, quæ fiunt ex univerſo orbe Chriſtiano, ſine ullis ambagibus cedere, ipſaque plenaria ſæpe priora poſterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clauſum erat, & cognoſcitur quod latebat, ſine ullo typho ſacrilegæ ſuperbiæ, ſine ullâ inflatâ cervice arrogantiæ, ſine ullâ contentione lividæ invidiæ, cum ſanctâ humilitate, cum pace Catholicâ, cum charitate Chriſtianâ, Aug. l. 2. de bapt. c. Donatiſt. c. 3.

P. 255.

have so immediately subjoyned to his former concerning a *general Council*, if he had judged it *Infallible*, or its decrees as certain as the *Scriptures*. In your second place *l.* 5. *c.* 7. there is nothing hath any Shadow of Pertinency to your Purpose; that which I suppose you may mean, is, *l.* 5. *c.* 17. where what he said before *was decreed by a General Council*, he after saith, *was the Judgment of the Holy Catholick Church*: From whence you may indeed infer that the *Catholick Church* did approve that *decree* of the *Council*, but how it proves it *Infallible* I cannot understand. Your last Place is one sufficiently known to be far enough from your Purpose, *Ep.* 118. *ad Januar.* where he saith, *In case of indifferent Rites, it is insolent madness to oppose the whole Church*; but you are an excellent Disputant, who can hence infer, that therefore *General Councils are Infallible in their Definitions in Matters of Faith.* For any thing then you have brought to the contrary St. *Austin* is far enough from the least danger of contradicting himself. But if you could prove that he were of your mind, that the Definitions of *Councils* are Infallible as well as the *Scriptures*, never did any man more expressly contradict himself than S. *Augustin* must do in a multitude of plain Places, wherein he saith, *That no other Writing is Infallible but the Scripture*; *That only according to them he judged freely of all other Writings*; and that *because he could yield an undoubted assent to none but them.* That *there is no other Writing wherein humane Infirmities are not discovered but in them*; that *men are at liberty to believe or not believe any thing besides the Scripture.* Can any man, who says these things, be reasonably supposed to assert that the Decrees of *General Councils are as certain as the Scripture is?* You see then what little advantage you have gained by this Attempt of offering to make St. *Austin* contradict himself, if in this place he should be supposed to assert that *General Councils* may err: which he doth plainly enough to any but those who are resolved not to understand him.

Aug. ep. 19. *ad Hieronymum c. Crescon. Grammat. l.* 2. *c.* 31. *De Nat. & Gratiâ c.* 61. *c. Faustum, l.* 11. *c.* 5. *Epistol.* 112.

§. 12. P. 256. This Prejudice being therefore removed, we come to the particular Evasions of this Place; which you thus sum up, in order to the defence of them. *That when he saith, Former General Councils may be amended by the latter, it is only to be understood in Matters of Fact, in Precepts pertaining to Manners and Discipline, or by way of more full and clear Explication of what had been delivered by former Councils.* To both these, his Lordship offers very just Exceptions. *To the first*, that it is to be *understood of Precepts of Manners and Discipline*; he saith, 1. *That* Bellarmine *contradicts himself, because he had said before, that General Councils cannot err in Precepts of Manners: No,* (say you) *this is no contradiction, because these depend much upon Circumstances of Time, Place, Person,* &c. *which varying, it often so falls out, that what at first was prudently judged fit to be done, becomes afterwards unfitting, and in this case one General Council may be amended by another, and yet neither charged with Error.* But do you suppose the mean while that St. *Austin* spake pertinently to this Business, or no? If he did, he can be understood only of such a *Precept* as that relating to the *Baptism* of *Hereticks.* Suppose then one *Council* should decree *Hereticks to be baptized*, and another afterwards correct this, and say, *They should not*, Will you say that neither of these were in an Error? So that your Answer is wholly impertinent to the Scope of St. *Austin*'s Discourse. And so his Lordship saith, *This whole Answer is concerning Precepts of Manners*: for St. *Austin disputes against the Error of St.* Cyprian *followed by the Donatists, which was an Error in Faith; namely, that true Baptism could not be given by Hereticks and such as were out of the Church.* But you say, *St.* Austin *doth not confine his Discourse to St.* Cyprian's *Case only, but by occasion of his, and his Councils Error, he lays down general Doctrine, touching the different Authority of the Writings of particular Bishops, Provincial,*

P. 241.

P. 257.

Provincial, National, and General Councils. Although I ſhould grant you this, it will make little for your Purpoſe; for St. *Auſtin*'s main Deſign is, to ſet the *Authority of Scripture* far above all theſe, and that in point of *Certainty* and *Infallibility*; and this being his main *Scope*, whatſoever he ſays of any of theſe, it is certain his Purpoſe is to ſhew that all of them fall ſhort of the *Sacred Scripture*, as to our yielding aſſent to them. For theſe in the firſt place are ſet by themſelves, as only being Infallible and deſerving an *undoubted Aſſent* to all that is contained in them; which being ſuppoſed, he proceeds to ſhew what the Extent is of all other *Authority* beſides this. For the *Writings* of *Biſhops* ſaith he, *they are ſo far from deſerving ſuch an aſſent as we give to the Scriptures, that they may be corrected by others, or by National Councils; and National Councils, by Plenary; and Plenary may be amended, the former by the latter.* In all which Gradations two things muſt be repeated ἀπὸ κοινοῦ as running through the whole Diſcourſe, which are, 1. The difference of all theſe from the *Scripture* in regard of our *yielding aſſent* to them; for that is it, which he begins with, that we are not in the leaſt to doubt, whether any thing contained therein be true or no; and then comes the other in by way of immediate *Antitheſis*; but, the *Writings* of *Biſhops*, &c. and although there be a *gradation* in all theſe, yet all of them are therein different from *Scripture*, that *whatſoever is found there may neither be doubted nor diſputed; but the Writings of Biſhops may be doubted or diſputed of, becauſe they may be corrected by other Biſhops or Councils. And thoſe National Councils may be, becauſe they may be corrected by General; and even theſe General Councils cannot require ſuch an undoubted aſſent as the Scripture doth, becauſe the former may be amended by the latter.* So that if you take the ſcope of St. *Auſtin*'s Diſcourſe in this Place, whether he ſpeaks generally, or particularly, nothing can be more evident, than that he puts this Difference between the *Scriptures*, and all other Writings or *Councils*, that the one may not at all be doubted or diſputed of, but the other may: and the common reaſon of all is, becauſe none are ſo *Infallible*, but they may be corrected by ſomething beſides themſelves, which cannot be in any Senſe ſaid of the *Scripture*. 2. Although Saint *Auſtin* adds that Clauſe, *Si quid in eis fortè à veritate deviatum eſt, If they have erred from the Truth*, only where he ſpeaks of the Writings of *Biſhops*; yet the ſeries of his Diſcourſe implies, that it ſhould be underſtood in what follows too: that, as the Writings of *Biſhops* may be corrected by *Councils, if they have erred*, ſo *National Councils* may be corrected by *General, if they have erred*; and ſo former *General Councils by latter* on the ſame *Suppoſition* ſtill, *that they have erred.* For, as the *Errors* was ſuppoſed to be the grouud of *Correction* in the former, it muſt be likewiſe of *Amendment* here. And whatever is not ſo *perfect*, but that it may be *amended*, cannot be ſuppoſed *Infallible*; for, if the Perſons had been *Infallible*, who had made thoſe Decrees in *General Councils*, they would have prevented any neceſſity of further *Amendments* by *ſucceeding Councils*. So that, take *Amendment* in what ſenſe you will, either for *ſupplying Defects*, or *correcting Errours*, it is deſtructive to your Pretence, that the Decrees of *General Councils* are *Infallible*, and as certain as the *Scripture*. Which is ſo repugnant to the ſcope of this Speech of S. *Auſtin*, as nothing can be more. Your *Criticiſm* then, *from the ſignification of* emendare *from* menda, *and* menda *from* minus, *and ſo importing only the taking away any defect*, yields you no Relief at all: For that *Defect* which is ſuppoſed in General *Councils*, which needs that *Emendation*, doth ſufficiently argue, there was no *Infallible Aſſiſtance* of the *Spirit* of *God* in the Decrees of thoſe *Councils*. For where *God's Spirit* aſſiſts *Infallibly*, P. 258.

bly, it leaves no ſuch *Defects* as are neceſſary to be *amended* afterwards, by ſome other *Council* which can pretend to no higher Aſſiſtance than the other had before. But your critical Judgment is not extraordinary, if you will have the Signification of Words taken from the conjectural *Etymologies* of them, ſuch as this of *Scaliger* is in the place where he corrects *Varro's Etymologies* (at the end of his *Conjectanea*) but, beſides that, all Attempts of that Nature are but *Conjectural Eſſays*, it is but an ill way to judge of the uſe of a Word by the *Etymology* of it; for, What Multitudes of Words are carried further in their Senſe, than their *Originals* would bear? His Lordſhip therefore takes a far ſurer way to know S. *Auſtin*'s meaning, than running to *Martinius* for the Signification of the Word *menda*; which is, by producing a parallel Place in S. *Auſtin*, where it is taken for to *correct*, and ſuppoſes an evident Fault? *aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur*; where *emendare* is, plainly to *amend* ſomething *amiſs*, not to *ſupply* ſomething *defective*. So that *Stapleton*'s Senſe of *amending* by *Explication* of ſomething *not fully known*, and not by *Correction* of ſomething *erroneous*, cannot here have place. For, as his Lordſhip well obſerves, the *National Council*, which S. *Auſtin* did in this Diſpute ſpeak moſt of, was not guilty meerly of not fully explaining it ſelf, but of a *poſitive Error*, *viz.* that under S. *Cyprian*, determining that *Baptiſm of Hereticks was no Baptiſm*. And therefore when S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of *Amendment*, it is ſuch an *Amendment* as doth ſuppoſe *Error*, and not barely *defect*. And ſo the Words uſed before of *reprehenſion* and *yielding*, do both imply more than a bare Explanation; and thoſe which follow after, evince it fully, where St. *Auſtin* lays down the Cautions, whereby ſuch *Amendments* ſhould be made, *without ſacrilegious Pride, or ſwelling Arrogancy, without Contention of Envy, and in holy Humility, in Catholick Peace, in Chriſtian Charity*. All which Words were very needleſs, if he meant only an *Explanation* of ſomething not *fully declared* before; but are very neceſſary, ſuppoſing it to be the *Amendment* of ſome former *Error*. All the Anſwer you have, is, *That theſe laſt Words relate not in particular to General Councils* (by no means, although they follow them at the Heels) *but to the other ſeveral Subjects*, viz. *private Biſhops, Provincial and National Councils; which are ſubject to Pride, Arrogancy, and Contention in their Emendations*. But, Was not S. *Auſtin* an unhappy Man then at expreſſing himſelf, that he muſt needs ſet thoſe Caveats after he had ſpoken of *General Councils*, which refer to the Particulars that went before, without any reference to the immediate *Antecedents*? For if they do at all reſpect the Proceedings of *General Councils*, (as doubtleſs they do, and that moſt immediately, as appears to any one who reads them) then they imply ſtill, that this *Amendment* of *General Councils* muſt be done without *Pride*, *Arrogance* and *Envy*, and with the *greateſt Humility*, and *Peace*, and *Charity*; which it is hard to conceive why S. *Auſtin* ſhould add, unleſs he ſuppoſed ſome *Errors* to be *amended* in them. Nothing remains further for the clearing this Place, but only that his Lordſhip mentions that which he calls. *The pooreſt ſhift of all in* Bellarmin, *viz.* that he ſpeaks of *unlawful Councils*: and it is a ſign it is ſo indeed, when you have nothing more to ſay for it, *but only, that it was given* ex ſuperabundanti, *and with a Peradventure*. When his Lordſhip concludes, *that the Pope's Confirmation to make Councils Infallible, is a meer trick, and unknown to the ancient Church*; you have nothing more to prove it to be grounded on the *Practice of Councils* of the *Church*, and of *Reaſon*, but to refer the Reader back to what you have ſaid about the *Pope's Supremacy*; and therefore I muſt do ſo too, for an Anſwer to what you have ſaid on that Subject.

C. Fauſtum. l. 20. c. 21.

Ibid.

P. 244.

The

The next thing which belongs to this Queſtion, is contained in his Lordſhips ſixth *Conſideration*; which is, *If the Definition of a General Council be Infallible, then the Infallibility of it, is either in the Concluſion, and in the Means that prove it; or in the Concluſion, not the Means; or in the Means, not the Concluſion. But it is Infallible in none of theſe. Not in the firſt; for there are divers Deliberations in General Councils, where the Concluſion is Catholick, but the means by which they prove it, not Infallible. Not in the ſecond; for the Concluſion muſt always follow the Nature of the Premiſes, or Principles out of which it is deduced; therefore if thoſe which the Council uſes, be ſometimes uncertain, the Concluſion cannot be Infallible. Not in the third; for the Concluſion cannot but be true and neceſſary, if the means be ſo.* Your anſwer is, *That it is Infallible in the Concluſion, that is, in the Doctrine defined, though it be not Infallible in the Means, or Arguments upon which it proceeded to the Definition. And your Reaſon is, becauſe one is neceſſary for the Government of the Church, but the other is not; for,* Deus non deficit in neceſſariis, nec redundat in ſuperfluis. You mean, it is neceſſary for you to aſſert it, whether it hath any Foundation in Reaſon or no: For you have not yet proved, that the *Infallibility* of *General Councils* is neceſſary for the *Churches Government*, and therefore cannot thence infer ſo great an Abſurdity as this; that, where all the *Premiſes* are fallible and uncertain, yet the *Concluſion* may be prophetical and Infallible. But ſo involved and obſcure are your Diſcourſes on this ſubject, that while you pretend a *General Council* is *ſeeing Viſions*, one might eaſily believe *you were dreaming Dreams*. For, I pray, ſpeak out, and tell us, what you mean by *Councils being fallible in the uſe of Means, and yet Infallible in the Concluſion* drawn from thoſe *Premiſes*, which ſhe was fallible in the deducing the Concluſion from? For the deducing the Concluſion, is in the *uſe of the Means*; therefore how is it poſſible that the *Council* ſhould be *Infallible* in the *Concluſion*, when it was fallible in making that *Concluſion*? But it may be I do not yet fully apprehend what you would have, neither I doubt do you. For you would fain be Infallible in the *Concluſion* too, without ſo much as *Truth* in the *Premiſes*. But I ſhall attempt to make you ſpeak intelligibly; it muſt be one of theſe two things you mean, when you ſay, *Councils* are *Infallible* in the *Concluſion*, either that they are *Infallible in deducing the Concluſion*, or in *aſſenting to the Concluſion*. If *Infallible* in the deducing the *Concluſion*, then it muſt be Infallible in the *uſe of the Means*; for, unleſs it doth infallibly diſcern the *Connexion* of the *Premiſes*, it is impoſſible it ſhould be Infallible in drawing the Concluſion from them. So that it is *Nonſenſe*, and a *Contradiction* to ſay, That, a *Council* is Infallible in the drawing a *Concluſion*, and not Infallible in the *uſe of the Means*, For, it is to ſay, It is *Infallible*, and not *Infallible* at the ſame time, and about the ſame thing, and in the ſame manner. For, What is drawing a *Concluſion*, but a diſcerning that *Truth* which reſults from the *Connexion* of the Premiſes together? For that which is concluded, hath all its *Truth* depending upon the Evidence of the *Premiſes*, otherwiſe it is a *ſimple Propoſition*, and not a *Concluſion*. If you had then ſaid, That the *Spirit* of *God* did *immediately reveal* to the *Council* the Truth of what was to be decreed; you had ſpoken that which might have been underſtood, though not believed; but this you durſt not ſay, for fear of the charge of *Enthuſiaſms*, and new *Revelations*: but when you ſay, The *Council* muſt *uſe Means*, and make *Syllogiſms*, as other fallible Creatures do, but then it is *Infallible* in the drawing the *Concluſion* from the *Premiſes* (though it be fallible in the Connexion of thoſe *Premiſes*) is an unparallell'd Piece of profound Nonſenſe.

§. 13. P. 248.

P. 263.

For, ſuppoſe the matter the *Council* was to determine, was the *Pope's Infallibility*; in order to the proving this, you ſay, The *Council* muſt uſe all Arguments tending to prove it; there comes in *Chriſt's Prayer for S.* Peter, *that his Faith ſhould not fail*, and that this muſt be extended to his *Succeſſors*, thence the Argument is formed. *Whomſoever Chriſt prayed for, that his Faith ſhould not fail, is Infallible*; *but Chriſt prayed for the Pope, that his Faith ſhould not fail; therefore he is Infallible.* Now you ſay, The *Council* is *fallible* in the *uſe of the Means* for this Concluſion, *i. e.* it may not infallibly believe the *Truth* of the *major* or *minor Propoſition*, but yet it may *infallibly* deduce thence the Concluſion, though all the Strength of the Concluſion depends upon the Truth of the *Premiſes*. You muſt therefore either aſſert that the Decrees of Councils are immediately revealed as *Divine Oracles*, or elſe that they are *fallible Concluſions* drawn from *fallible Premiſes*. And, were it not for a little Shame, becauſe of your charging others with *immediate Revelations*, I doubt not but you would aſſert the former; which you muſt of Neceſſity do, if you will maintain the *Infallibility of General Councils*: For if there be any Infirmity in the uſe of the Premiſes, it muſt of Neceſſity be in the Concluſion too. But, ſuppoſe you mean *an Infallible Aſſent to the Matter of the Concluſion*, though it be fallibly deduced, you are as far to ſeek as ever; for, Whereon muſt that *Aſſent* be grounded? It muſt be either upon the *Truth* of the *Premiſes*, or ſomething *immediately revealed*: If on the *Truth* of the *Premiſes*, the *Aſſent* can be no ſtronger than the Grounds are on which it is built; if on ſomething revealed, it muſt needs be ſtill an *immediate Revelation*. But I forget my ſelf all this while, to urge you thus with Abſurdities conſequent from Reaſon; for, in anſwer to his Lordſhip, you grant, *That it is a thing altogether unknown in Nature, and Art too, that fallible Principles can either as Father or Mother, beget or bring forth an Infallible Concluſion*; for, when his Lordſhip had objected this, you return him this Anſwer, *That this is a falſe Suppoſition of the Biſhop, for the Concluſion is not ſo much the Child of thoſe Premiſes* (*i. e.* it is not the Concluſion) *as the Fruit of the Holy Ghoſt, directing and guiding the Council, to produce an Infallible Concluſion, whatever the Premiſes be* (true, or falſe, certain, or uncertain, all is a Caſe.) *This is neceſſary for the Peace and Unity of the Church* (to believe Contradictions) *and therefore not to be denied, unleſs an impoſſibility be ſhewed therein.* (I doubt, believing Contradictions is accounted no Impoſſibility with you.) *But, I hope, no man will attaque God's Omnipotency, and deprive him of the Power of doing this.* Is it come to that at laſt? Whatever you aſſert that is repugnant to the common reaſon of Mankind, and involves *Contradictions* in it, that you call for *God's Omnipotency* to help you in. Thus *Tranſubſtantiation* muſt be believed, becauſe *God is Omnipotent*; and that Men may believe any thing, though not grounded on *Scripture*, and *repugnant* to *Reaſon*, becauſe *God is Omnipotent*. We acknowledge *God's Omnipotency*, as much as you, but we dare not put it to ſuch ſervile Uſes, to make good any abſurd Imaginations of our Brains. If you had ſaid, It was poſſible for *God* to enlighten the Minds of the *Biſhops* in a *General Council*, either to diſcern infallibly the *Truth* of the *Premiſes*, or *immediately to reveal* the Truth of the *Concluſion*, you had ſpoken intelligible Falſhoods. But to ſay, that *God* permits them to be fallible in the *uſe* of the *Means*, and in drawing the *Concluſion* from them; but to be *Infallible* in the *Concluſion* it ſelf, without any *immediate Revelation*, and then to challenge *God's Omnipotency* for it: I know not whether it be a greater *Diſhonour* to *God*, or *Reproach* to *Humane Underſtanding*. And if ſuch *Incongruities* as theſe are,

do

do not diſcover that you are *miſerably hampered*, as his Lordſhip ſaith, in this Argument, I know not what will.

But we muſt proceed to diſcover more of them; two things his Lordſhip very rationally objects againſt *Stapleton*'s Aſſertion, *That the Council is diſcurſive in the uſe of the means, but prophetical in delivering the Concluſion.* 1. *That ſince this is not according to Principles of Nature and Reaſon, there muſt be ſome ſupernatural Authority, which muſt deliver this Truth* (which, ſaith he, *muſt be the Scripture*) *For if you fly to immediate Revelations; the Enthuſiaſm muſt be yours. But the Scriptures which are brought, in the very Expoſition of all the Primitive Church, neither ſay it, nor enforce it. Therefore Scripture warrants not your Prophecy in the Concluſion. Neither can the Tradition: Produce one Father, who ſays, This is an Univerſal Tradition of the Church, that her Definitions in a General Council are prophetical, and by immediate Revelation: Produce any one Father that ſays it of his own Authority, that he thinks ſo.* To all this you very gravely ſay nothing; and we can ſhrewdly gueſs at the Reaſon of it. 2. His Lordſhip proves, *That it is a Repugnancy to ſay, That the Council is prophetical in the Concluſion, and diſcurſive in the uſe of the Means; for no Prophet, in that which he delivered from God as Infallible Truth, was ever diſcurſive at all in the uſe of the means; Nay* (ſaith he) *make it but probable in the ordinary Courſe of Prophecy, and I hope you go no higher, nor will I offer at God's abſolute Power* (but his Lordſhip was deceived in you, for you run to *God's* Omnipotency) *that that which is diſcurſive in the means, can be prophetical in the Concluſion, and you ſhall be my great* Apollo *for ever.* And this, he ſhews, *is contrary to what your own Authors deliver concerning the nature and kinds of Prophecy, and that none of them were by diſcourſe.* To this you anſwer, *That both* Stapleton *and you deny that the Church is ſimply prophetical, either in the Premiſes or Concluſion, but rather the quite contrary; and that by the Definition of the Councils being prophetical in an Analogical Senſe, no more is meant but that by virtue of divine Aſſiſtance and Direction, ſuch a Concluſion or Definition, in regard of preciſe Verity, is as infallibly true and certain, as if it were a Prophecy.* But if you had a mind that we ſhould underſtand, or believe what you ſay, Why do not you come more out of the Clouds, and ſhew us the Difference between that which is *ſimply prophetical*, and that which is only *Analogically* ſo, but as infallibly true and certain as the other? But, that you may no longer blind the World with ſuch inſignificant Diſcourſes, I ſhall put you upon ſpeaking more diſtinctly, by enquiring into thoſe Ways, whereby *God* may be ſuppoſed ſupernaturally to work upon the Minds of Men, in order to the Diſcovery of Truth. Theſe two Ways we may conceive that *God* may make known *Truth* to the Minds of Men. 1. *By the immediate diſcovery of ſomething, which could not otherwiſe be known but by immediate Revelation:* And of this Nature were all thoſe *future Events* which were revealed to the *Prophets*, and this I ſuppoſe you call *ſimply prophetical*; ſo likewiſe all thoſe *Doctrines* which are of pure *Revelation, i. e.* ſuch as could never have been known, unleſs God had revealed them: of which kind there are ſeveral in the Goſpel. 2. *God may diſcover ſuch Things to the minds of men, which, though they might otherwiſe be known, yet not with that degree of certainty, as by this immediate Aſſiſtance of God's Spirit:* Now this I ſuppoſe, is that you call *Analogically prophetical*, which you aſſert *to differ nothing at all from Prophecy, in regard of Infallible Truth and Certainty, being by virtue of divine Aſſiſtance and Direction.* And this you ſay a *General Council* hath, but not the former.

p. 14. P. 249.

P. 264.

§. 15. Now to convince you of the Abſurdity of your Aſſertions, I ſhall ſhew you theſe two things. 1. *That this cannot be without an immediate Revelation.* 2. *That being ſo, it cannot be diſcurſive, as you ſay it is* in the uſe of the means. 1. *That this cannot be without an immediate Revelation:* For which I need nothing but your own Aſſertions, *viz.* that this is a higher diſcovery of Truth, than *nature* can ever attain to, or ordinary *Grace*; and that it is ſuch as obliges all men *to an internal aſſent to it*, when it is declared. Now I ſhall deſire you, or any of your party, to tell me, What Difference there is between this, and the *Inſpiration* which the *Apoſtles* had in writing the *Books* of *Scripture*. I mean not ſuch as contain *Prophecies* in them, but thoſe which deliver to us the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*: as for *Inſtance*, in S. *John*'s Goſpel, he doth not pretend to deliver any thing which was not revealed before, but to give an Account of the *Doctrine* and life of *Chriſt*. And ſo that *Inſpiration* was not *ſimply prophetical*, as in writing the *Prophecies* in the *Apocalypſe*, but *Analogically* ſo, in that ſuch an Aſſiſtance of *God's Spirit*, as made what he writ, to be as infallibly true and certain, as if it were a *Prophecy*, which are your own Words concerning the *Infallibility* of *Councils*. Shew us therefore any rational Difference between this kind of *Infallibility*, and that *Inſpiration* by which the *Books* of *Scripture* are written. If you ſay, the one was *immediate* and the other not, you beg the Queſtion; For I am proving that what you aſſert, doth neceſſarily imply, that it is as *immediate* as that which the *Apoſtles* had. Nay, I will go yet further, and ſay it is as immediate as that which the *Apoſtles* themſelves had in *Council*. For when they ſaid, *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us*, Can any thing more poſſibly be underſtood, than that the *Spirit* of *God* did ſo far aſſiſt their minds, that they ſhould not err in their Definitions? And therefore when of late you are grown (forſooth) ſomewhat jealous of the word *Infallibility*, and you give us a grave Advertiſement at the end of your *Preface*, *that you do not mean by it an intrinſecal unerring power in all things, in thoſe whom you account Infallible, but only that they never have erred, nor ſhall err in definitions of Faith*; you do not at all advantage your ſelves by it. For none of your conſiderate Adverſaries do charge you ſo much with uſurping *God's incommunicable Attribute of Infallibility*, (which is thereby avoided becauſe you pretend to derive it from him) but that you challenge the ſame *Infallibility* which the *Apoſtles* had. And ſo muſt of Neceſſity aſſert as much of *Divine Enthuſiaſm* and *immediate Revelation* in your *Church*, as any of the *Apoſtles* themſelves had. For whatever they had, came *by virtue of Chriſt's Promiſe*, and that is all you ſay for the *Churches Infallibility*; but that doth no more take it off from being an *immediate Revelation* in the *Church*, than it did in the Apoſtles. If you ſay, *The Church is only ſecured that it neither hath erred, nor can err in Definitions of Faith*, What more had the *Apoſtles* than this? And if this in them did require an *immediate Inſpiration*, certainly it muſt do ſo in the *Church* too. But you ſay, *Neither Church nor Council do publiſh immediate Revelations, nor create any new Articles of Faith, but only declare and unfold by their Definitions, that Doctrine, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles in ſome manner firſt delivered.* But all this, ſuppoſing it true, doth not hinder, but the *Councils Infallibility* muſt imply an *immediate Revelation* on the *part* of the *Council*, though not of the *Doctrine* decreed by them. For granting the *Decrees* of the *Council* are no *new Articles of Faith* (which is yet contrary to your own Principles; for if by the Definitions of *Councils* that may be *de fide* which was not before, then the *Councils* do make *new Articles of Faith*, though not *new Doctrines*) *i. e.* that the *matter of them in ſome manner was before revealed*, yet ſince you ſay *the Council in declaring them,*

Ibid.

them, hath an Infallibility, equal to Prophecy, it must be by *immediate Inspiration*. For, Hath the *Council* greater Certainty, and higher Assistance than any ordinary Believer hath or not? If not, it can be no more *Infallible* than an ordinary Believer; if it hath, it must be *immediate*, because it hath a higher degree of Certainty, than can be attained by the *use of means*. And to say this, as you do expressly, when you assert the *Council* fallible in the *use of Means*, but infallible in the *Conclusion*, is a most palpable Contradiction. For, it is to assert a *Certainty* beyond and above the *use of means*, and yet not *immediate*. But here lies your perpetual Mistake, as though nothing could be an *immediate Revelation*, but what is a *Revelation* of some *Doctrine never revealed before*: whereas if there be a further Explanation of that Doctrine in as *Infallible* a manner as the *Apostles* at first revealed it, that *Explanation* is by as immediate a *Revelation*, as the first Discovery of it. As is clear in the *Council* of the *Apostles*, for I hope you will not deny, but the non-obligation of the Ceremonial *Law* was *in some manner revealed to them before*; and yet I hope you will not say, but the *Apostles* had an *immediate Revelation* as to what they decreed in that *Council*. It is very plain therefore, that when you say, *General Councils neither have erred nor can err in their Definitions*, they usurp as great a Privilege thereby as ever the *Apostles* had, and in order to it must have as *immediate* an *Inspiration*. For, never was there any such *Infallibility*, either in the *Prophets* or *Apostles*, as did suppose an *absolute Impossibility of Error*; but it was wholly *hypothetical* in case of *Divine Assistance*, which hindred them from any Capacity of erring so long as that continued with them and no longer. For, *Inspiration* was no *permanent Habit*, but a *transient Act* in them; and that being removed, they were liable to Errors as well as others; from whence it follows, that where *Revelations* were most *immediate*, they did no more than what you assume to your *Church*, viz. *preserve them from actual Error in declaring God's Will*. So that nothing can be more evident than that you challenge as great an *Infallibility*, and as *immediate Assistance* of *God's Spirit* in *Councils* as ever the *Prophets* and *Apostles* had. And therefore that *Divine* was in the right, of whom *Canus* speaks, who asserted, *That since General Councils were Infallible, their Definitions ought to be equalled with the Scriptures themselves*. And although *Canus* and others dislike this, it is rather because of the *odium* which would follow it, than for any just *Reason* they give, why it should not follow. For they not only suppose as great a *Certainty* or *Infallibility* in the *Decrees* of both, but an equal *Obligation* to *internal Assent* in those to whom they are declared. Which doth further prove, that the *Revelation* must be *immediate*: for if by virtue of those *Definitions*, we are obliged to *assent* to the Doctrines contained in them as Infallibly true, there must be an *immediate Divine Authority* which must command our *Assent*. For nothing short of that can oblige us to believe any thing as of *Divine Revelation*; now *Councils* require, that we must believe their *Definitions* to be *Divine Truths*, though Men were not *obliged* to believe them to be so, before those *Definitions*. For that is your express Doctrine, *That though the Matters decreed in Councils were in some manner revealed before, yet not so as to oblige all Men with an explicite assent to believe them*; but after the Definitions of *Councils* they are bound to do it. So that though there be not an *Object* newly *revealed*, yet there ariseth a *new Obligation* to *internal Assent*; which *Obligation* cannot come but from *immediate Divine Authority*. If you say, *The Obligation comes not simply by virtue of the Council's Definitions, but by a Command extant in Scripture, whereby all are bound to give this Assent to the Decrees of Councils*;

Canus, l. 5. c. 5.

Councils; I then ſay, we muſt be excuſed from it, till you have diſcharged this *new Obligation* upon your ſelf, by producing ſome expreſs Teſtimony of *Scripture* to that purpoſe; which is, I think, ſufficient to keep our Minds at Liberty from this *internal Aſſent* to the Definitions of *General Councils* by virtue of any *Infallibility* in them. And thus having more at large conſidered the Nature of this *Infallibility* which you challenge to *General Councils*, and having ſhewed that it implies as *immediate a Revelation* as the *Apoſtles* had; the ſecond thing is ſufficiently demonſtrated, *That this Infallibility cannot ſuppoſe diſcurſiveneſs with Fallibility in the uſe of the means*, becauſe theſe two are repugnant to each other.

§. 16. The next thing to be conſidered, is, Stapleton's *Argument, why Councils muſt be Prophetical in the Concluſion; becauſe that which is determined by the Church is matter of Faith, and not of Knowledge, and the aſſent required elſe would not be an aſſent of Faith, but an Habit of Knowledge.* To which his
P. 251. Lordſhip anſwers, *That he ſees no Inconvenience in it, if it be granted; for one and the ſame Concluſion may be Faith to the Believer, that cannot prove; and knowledge to the learned, that can.* Which he further explains thus: *Some ſupernatural Principles which Reaſon cannot demonſtrate ſimply, muſt be ſuppoſed in order to Faith; but theſe Principles being owned, Reaſon being thereby inlightned, that may ſerve to convert or convince Philoſophers, and the great Men of Reaſon in the very point of Faith where it is at the higheſt.* This he brings down *to the Buſineſs of Councils; as to which*, he ſaith, *that the firſt immediate, fundamental Points of Faith, as they cannot be proved ſimply by Reaſon, ſo neither need they be determined by any Council, nor ever were they attempted, they are ſo plain ſet down in Scripture. If about the Senſe and true meaning of theſe, or neceſſary Deduction out of the prime Articles of Faith, General Councils determine any thing, as they have done at.* Nice *and the reſt; there is no Inconvenience, that one and the ſame Canon of the Council ſhould be believed as it reflects upon the Articles and Grounds indemonſtrable; and yet known to the Learned, by the means and proof, by which that Deduction is vouched and made good. And again the concluſion of a Council, ſuppoſe that in* Nice *about the Conſubſtantiality of Chriſt with the Father, in it ſelf conſidered, is indemonſtrable by Reaſon; there* (ſaith he) *I believe, and aſſent in Faith: but the ſame concluſion if you give me the ground of Scripture and the Creed (for ſomewhat muſt be ſuppoſed in all whether Faith or Knowledge) is demonſtrable by natural Reaſon againſt any Arrian in the World.* So that he concludes, *The weaker ſort of Chriſtians may aſſent by Faith, where the more learned may build it on Reaſon, the Principles of Faith being ſuppoſed.* This is the Subſtance of his Lordſhip's Diſcourſe. In Anſwer to which, you tell us, *That the Biſhop ſeems to broach a new Doctrine, that the aſſent of*
P. 265. *Faith may be an Habit of Knowledge. But ſurely* (ſay you) *Divine Faith is according to the Apoſtle*, Heb. 11. *an Argument of things which do not appear*, viz. *by the ſame means, by which we give this aſſent of Faith: otherwiſe our Faith would not be free and meritorious.* An Anſwer I muſt needs ſay, hugely ſuitable to your Principles, who are moſt concerned of all Men to ſet *Reaſon* at a diſtance from Faith; and ſo you do ſufficiently in this Diſcourſe of it. For it is no eaſie matter to underſtand what you mean, but that is not to be wondered at, ſince you make *Obſcurity* ſo neceſſary to *Faith. Divine Faith is* (you ſay) *an Argument of things which do not appear.* viz. *by the ſame means, by which we give this aſſent of Faith.* Do you mean that the *Objects of Faith do not appear*? Or that the *Reaſon* of *believing* doth not? If only the former, which is all the *Apoſtle* means; that is nothing to your purpoſe, for we are not enquiring, whether Men may not believe

believe *the Things which are not ſeen*, but, whether the *aſſent* of *Faith* may not be *conſiſtent with Reaſon*: which I am ſo far from thinking any ſtrange Doctrine, that I cannot ſee how there can be an *aſſent* of *Faith* without *Reaſon*. And they muſt be ſuch great *Meriters at God's Hands*, as you are, who muſt think to oblige him with believing what you cannot underſtand, or ſee any Ground in Reaſon for. For, *aſſent* being an *Act* of the *Mind*, cannot be elicited without ſufficient Reaſon perſwading the Mind to it; or elſe, it is *ſo far from being free*, and as you (who are ſo loth to be beholding to *God*) call it, *meritorious*, that it is brutiſh and irrational. Not that there are *Demonſtrations* to be expected for every thing we *believe*, but there muſt be ſufficient *Reaſon* for the *Mind* to build its *aſſent* upon, and that *Reaſon* is *Evidence*, and that *Evidence* deſtroys that *Obſcurity* which you make neceſſary to Faith. *Evidence*, I ſay, not of the *Object*, but of the *Reaſon* and *Obligation* to *aſſent*. When you ſay, *That Faith, as Faith, cannot be Knowledge*, his Lordſhip grants it; but yet it doth not thence follow, that what may be believed by one may not be known by another; and *though Chriſt* (as you add) *did not ſet up a School of Knowledge but of Faith*, yet he did not ſet up a *School of blind implicit Faith*, but ſuch a one as conſiſts of a rational and diſcurſive Act of the Mind. You muſt not therefore expect that we ſhould believe the Definitions of *Councils* becauſe they pretend to be *Infallible*, but you muſt firſt convince our *Reaſons* that they are ſo, and then we ſhall aſſent to them. But you have very well contrived your Buſineſs, to have an *obſcure*, *implicite Faith*, for ſuch *Doctrines* which are ſo far from any *Evidence* of *Reaſon*.

CHAP. II.

Of the Uſe and Authority of General Councils.

The denying the Infallibility of General Councils takes not away their Uſe and Authority. Of the Submiſſion due to them by all particular Perſons. How far external Obedience is required in caſe they err. No violent Oppoſition to be made againſt them. Rare Inconveniences hinder not the effect of a juſt Power. It cannot rationally be ſuppoſed, that ſuch General Councils as are here meant ſhould often or dangerouſly err. The true Notion of a General Council explained. The Freedom requiſite in the Proceedings of it. The Rule it muſt judge by. Great difference between external Obedience, and internal aſſent to the Decrees of Councils. This later unites Men in Error, not the former. As great Uncertainties ſuppoſing General Councils Infallible as not. Not ſo great certainty requiſite for Submiſſion as Faith. Whether the Romaniſts Doctrine of the Infallibility of Councils, or ours, tend more to the Churches Peace? St. Auſtin explained. The Keys according to him given to the Church. No unremediable Inconvenience, ſuppoſing a General Council err. But Errors in Faith are ſo, ſuppoſing them Infallible when they are not. The Church hath Power to reverſe the Decrees of General Councils. The Power of Councils not by Divine Inſtitution. The Unreaſonableneſs of making the Infallibility of Councils depend on the Pope's Confirmation. No conſent among the Romaniſts about the Subject of Infallibility, whether in Pope or Council. No Evidence from Scripture, Reaſon, or Antiquity, for the Pope's Perſonal Infallibility.

§. 1. THE *firſt Queſtion* being thus diſpatched, I now come to the *ſecond*, which is, *Of what Uſe and Authority General Councils are in the Church, ſuppoſing them not Infallible?* And here again two things are to be examined;

examined; first, *How far General Councils are to be submitted to.* Secondly, *Whether our Opinion or yours tend more to the Peace of the Church*; for both these his Lordship handles distinctly, and so shall we. For the first, nothing is more necessary than throughly to understand his Lordship's
P. 245. meaning, which he most fully delivers in these Words. *General Councils lawfully called and ordered and lawfully proceeding, are a great and awful Representation, and cannot err in Matters of Faith, keeping themselves to God's Rule, and not attempting to make a new one of their own; and are with all Submission to be observed by every Christian, where Scipture, or evident Demonstration, comes not against them.* Two things you mainly object against this Opinion. 1. *That in case such a Council err, it tends only to unite Men in Error.* 2. *Who shall be Judge of all those Conditions implyed in the Councils Proceedings?* To these two, all that I can find material scattered up and down in your Discourse on this Subject, may be reduced. For the *first*, we must consider the occasion of his Lordship's Entrance into this *Subject* concerning *General Councils, how far they may err, or not*, which he saith *is a Question of great Consequence in the Church of God. For to say they can-*
P. 223. *not err, leaves the Church not only without Remedy against an Error once determined; but also without Sense that it may need a Remedy, and so without care to seek it, which is the Misery of the Church of* Rome *at this Day. To say they can err, seems to expose the Members of the Church to an uncertainty and wavering in the Faith, to make unquiet Spirits not only to disrespect former Councils of the Church, but also to slight and contemn whatsoever they may now determine.* So that, great Inconveniences appearing on both sides, his Lordship endeavours to steer his Course so as not to dash on the *Rocks* of either side, by betraying the *Churches Faith* in asserting their *Infallibility*, or the *Churches Peace* by acknowledging them *fallible.* But as he could not see any *Reason* to believe them *Infallible*, so neither could he see any *Necessity* that the *Churches Peace* should be broken, supposing them not to be so. And the most obvious Objection being, *If a General Council be fallible, what is to be*
P. 224. *done in case it should err?* For that, he propounds this *Expedient, That the Determination of a General Council erring was to stand in Force, and to have external Obedience at the least yielded to it, till Evidence of Scripture, or a Demonstration to the contrary made the Error appear; and until thereupon another Council of equal Authority did reverse it.* And he after explains what he
P. 226. means by this *external Obedience*, viz. *That which consists in Silence, Patience, and Forbearance yielded to it:* which he builds on this Reason, *That Controversies arising in the Church must have some end, or they'll tear all in sunder: therefore supposing a General Council should err, and an erring Decree be by the Law it self invalid, I would have it,* (saith he) *wisely considered again (supposing the Council not to err in Fundamental Verity) whether it be not fit to allow a General Council that Honour and Privilege, which all other great Courts have; Namely,*
P. 227. *that there be a Declaration of the Invalidity of its decrees, as well as of the Laws of other Courts, before private Men can take Liberty to refuse Obedience.* Therefore he concludes, *That this seems most fit and necessary for the Peace of Christendom, unless in case the Error be manifest and intolerable, or that the whole Church upon peaceable and just Complaint of this Error neglect or refuse to call a Council to examine it: and there come in National and Provincial Councils to reform for themselves.* These Words contain the full account of his Lordship's Opinion, which you charge with so *many Interclashings and Inconveniences.* The first of
P. 242. which is, *That it tends only to oblige all the Members of the Church to an Unity in Error against Scripture and Demonstration, during their whole Lives, or rather to the World's end; since such an* Utopian *rectifying Council as the Bishop here Fansies,*

Fancies, is morally impossible ever to be had; and therefore you call it a strange (not to say an impious) Doctrine, advanced without Authority of God's Word, or Antiquity, nay contrary to all solid Reason.

This being a Charge of the highest Nature, and managed with such unmeasurable Confidence, we must somewhat further enquire into the Grounds of his Lordship's Opinion, to see whether it be guilty of these Crimes or no. There are three things therefore must be cleared in order to his Lordship's Vindication. 1. The Design of his *Discourse*. 2. The Suppositions he makes as to the Proceedings of the *Council*. 3. The *Obligation* of its Decrees supposing that it should err. §. 2.

1. *The design of his Discourse* is to be considered; which is to remedy a supposable Inconvenience, and to provide for the *Churches Peace*. For the first Question in debate was, *Whether a General Council might err, or no.* In which his Lordship gives sufficient Evidence from *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, and *Reason*, that it might. But then here comes an Inconvenience to be removed; for his *Adversary* objects, *What are we then nearer to Unity after a Council hath determined, supposing it may err?* To this his Lordship suits his Answer: wherein we ought to consider, that the Inconvenience objected is, on his Lordship's *Suppositions*, one of the *rara contingentia*; and such a one ought not to destroy a Principle of *Government* in all other Cases useful and necessary. For there cannot possibly be any way thought of for Peace and *Government*, but there may be a Supposition made of some notable Inconvenience; but that not being necessary, nor immediately consequent upon it, but something which may happen and far more probably may not, it ought not to hinder the obtaining of that, which is generally both useful and necessary. To give you a parallel case to this: It is granted on all Hands that the *civil Authority* of a Nation is Fallible, and therefore we may suppose it actually to err, and that so far as to bind Men by Law to something in it self unlawful. Will you say now, that the intent of *civil Authority* is to bind Men necessarily to Sin? I hope, you will not; but by this you may easily see the *Fallacy* of your arguing against his Lordship; for it is an Inconvenience indeed supposable, but not at all *necessary*; if he had said indeed, that *General Councils* must necessarily err, your Argument had been strong against him; but as it is, it hath no more Force against his Assertion, than the Supposition before made hath against civil Authority. For that case may be easily put, that such a *Law* may pass; but, doth this hinder Men from their *Obligation* to Duty and Submission to a just Authority? or, Will you have Men presently to renounce Obedience, and to repeal such a *Law* themselves, and not rather in all Ways of Duty and Reverence to Authority make known their just Complaints and desire a Redress by the Hands of Supream Authority? And this is all which his Lordship aims at, that in case a *General Council* should err (which is not easily imaginable upon his Suppositions) it tends more to the *Churches Peace* for private Men not to oppose the Decrees of it, but to endeavour that another *General Council* be called to repeal it, and till then to preserve the *Churches* Peace, supposing the Error not manifest or intolerable. In this case then there are two Inconveniences put: the one of them is, That when a *Council* is supposed to err, every particular Man may be at Liberty to oppose the Decrees of it, and so put the *Church* into Confusion; the other is, That though private Men may know it to be an Error, yet they should be patient till the *Church* by another *Council* may repeal it: Now these two Inconveniences being laid together, the Question is, Which is the greater? His Lordship with a great deal of *Reason* judges the former to be: because in the latter case it is only a

ſilencing of ſome leſs neceſſary *Truth* for ſome time; but in the other it is an expoſing the *Church* to the fury of Mens turbulent *Spirits*. But that which ſhews the unreaſonableneſs of your Objection, *That this is the way to bind the Church to an Union in Error*, is, that this doth not neceſſarily follow from his Lordſhip's Opinion, but is only a caſe ſuppoſeable; and no rare Inconvenience ought to prejudice a general good: And the Peace of the *Church* in ſuch a caſe ought to be preferred before private Mens Satisfaction.

§. 3. But this will further appear, if we conſider, *ſecondly*, the *Suppoſitions* his Lordſhip makes; for by that we ſhall ſee, how rarely incident this caſe is: for, I hope, the ſuppoſing that a *General Council* may err, doth not ſuppoſe that it muſt neceſſarily err; and granting thoſe things which are ſuppoſed by him, it is a rare caſe that it ſhould err For theſe things are by him ſuppoſed. 1. *That it muſt be a Council lawfully called and ordered*; and ſo, not ſuch Councils as that of *Trent* was, or any like it; wherein the *Pope* gives only a *General Summons*, and that it muſt be called a *General Council* on that account, how few *Biſhops* ſoever appear in it, nay, though the far greateſt part of the *Chriſtian* World be excluded from it: but it muſt be ſuch a *Council* as may be acknowledged to be *General*, by the *General Conſent* of the *Chriſtian World*. For that we would make our *Judge* in the caſe; as it was in the four firſt *General Councils*. Not that we would ſtand upon *Biſhops* being actually preſent from every particular *Church*, but that ſuch a Number be preſent from the greateſt *Churches*, as may make it not be ſuſpected to be meerly a *Faction*, packed together for the *Intereſt* of ſome potent *Prelate*; but that they do ſo indifferently meet from all Parts, that there may be no juſt ground of Suſpicion, that they deſign any thing but the common good of the Chriſtian World. And therefore we acknowledge the firſt *four General Councils* to be truly ſuch, in our preſent Senſe; neither do we quarrel at them, becauſe ſo few *Biſhops* were preſent, who lived out of the *Roman Empire*; for, ſuppoſing the *Church* at the ſame freedom from particular *Intereſts* that it was then, and ſo great a Number of *Biſhops* aſſembled together, we look on it to be *ſo great and awful a Repreſentation*, that its Determinations ought not to be oppoſed by any *factious* or turbulent *Spirits*. And in caſe ſome *Biſhops* be not preſent from ſome *Churches*, whether *Eaſtern* or *Weſtern*, yet if upon the publiſhing thoſe *Decrees*, they be *univerſally accepted*, that doth, *ex poſt-facto*, make the *Council* truly *Oecumenical*. By this you ſee, what we mean by a *General Council*. And, for *the calling of it*; though we ſay, it ſhould be by the conſent of the chief *Patriarchs*, yet the Right and Cuſtom of the ancient *Church* clearly carries it, that it ought to be ſummoned by the Authority of *Chriſtian Princes*: for, nothing can be more evident to ſuch, who will not ſhut their Eyes againſt the cleareſt Evidence, than that the firſt *General Councils* (before the *Pope* had got the better of the *Emperors*) were ſummoned by the *Emperor's* Command and Authority; and ſince the Diviſion of the *Empire* into ſo many *Kingdoms* and *Principalities*, the conſent of *Chriſtian Princes* is neceſſary on the ſame Grounds. Neither ought it only to be a *General Council*, and *lawfully called*, but *lawfully ordered too*, *viz.* that no *Prelate* challenge himſelf ſuch a *Preſidency* not in, but over the *Council*, that his *Inſtructions* muſt be looked on as the only *Chart* they muſt *ſteer* their *Courſe* by; and that nothing be debated, but *proponentibus Legatis*, as it was at *Trent*: for theſe things take away utterly that *Freedom* which is neceſſary for a *General Council*. And therefore his Lordſhip juſtly requires, 2. *That the Council do proceed lawfully*; which it cannot do, if it be *over awed*, as the *ſecond Epheſine* was by *Dioſcorus* and his

his Party; or if Practices be used, as at *Ariminum*: but there must be the greatest freedom in Debates, no canvasing for Votes, but every one suffered to deliver his Judgment, without Prejudice or Partiality, that those who give their Judgments, deliver their Reasons before, and not only appear *in Pontificalibus*, to give their *Placet*. That the *Bishops* present, be Men of unquestionable Abilities, and generally presumed to be well acquainted with the Matters to be debated there: For otherwise nothing would be more easie, than for the more subtil Men, under ambiguous Expressions, and fair Pretences to bring over a great Number of the rest to them, who want either Judgment or Learning enough to discern their Designs. And this is supposed to be the case of the *Council* at *Ariminum*, where the *Occidental Bishops*, for want of *Learning* were over-reached by the Subtilty of the *Arrian Party*. 3. His Lordship supposes, *That this Council keeps it self to God's Rule, and not attempt to make a new one of their own*: For in so doing they commit an Error in the *first Concoction*, which will be *incorrigible* afterwards. And this is not only reasonable, but just and necessary, because nothing can be a Rule of Faith, but what is of immediate *divine Revelation*; and this hath been the Practice of the first *General Councils*, which never owned or proceeded by any other Rule of *Faith* but this. These things being supposed, May we not justly say, That an erring Determination of such a *Council* so proceeding, is a *rare Case*? Since we believe, that *God* will not deny to any particular Person (who doth sincerely seek it) the *Knowledge of his Truth*, much less may we think he will do it to such an *awful Representation of the Church*, when assembled together purposely for finding out that Truth, which may be of so great Consequence to the *Christian World*. For both the *Truth* of *God's Promises*, the *goodness of God* to his *People*, and his *peculiar Care* of his *Church*, seem highly concerned, that such a *Council* should not be guilty of any notorious Error.

§. 4. But, because we deny not, but such a *Council* is fallible, therefore we grant the case may be put, that such a *Council* may err; and the Question is, What is to be done then? *Whether every particular Person may oppose such a Determination, or submit till another Council reverse the Decrees of it.* His Lordship asserts the latter; and so we come to the effect of such an erring Decree, which was the third thing to be spoken to. As to which, these things must be considered, 1. That he doth not assert, that Men are bound to *believe* the *Truth* of that *Decree*, but not *openly to oppose it*. For so he speaks expressly of *external Obedience*, and *at least so far as it consists in Silence, Patience, and Forbearance yielded to it*. And therefore you are greatly deceived, when with such confidence you assert, *That this obliges all the Members of the Church to Unity in Error*; for that is only consequent upon your Principle, that the Decrees of *General Councils* are to be believed by an *internal Assent*: for this indeed would necessarily oblige them to *Unity in Error*; but the most that is consequent on his Lordship's Opinion, is, that in such cases wherein a *General Council* hath erred, Men ought rather to be *silent* for a time as to some *Truth*, than to break the *Church's Peace*. In the mean time, he doth not deny, but that Men may be bound to follow their own *Judgments* in the Discovery of Truth; nay, and they may use all means consistent with the *Churches Peace*, to promote that *Truth*; for he allows that *just Complaints may be made to the Church for reversing the Decrees of the former Council*, and this cannot be without discovering the Error of that *Council*. And I hope this Liberty of dissent and just Complaint, is sufficient to keep all the Members of the Church from being united in *Error*. And, I pray Sir, What cause is there now for such *hideous Out-cries, that this is such a strange*

and impious Doctrine, against Scripture, Antiquity, and solid Reason, which appears, for all that I can see, very just and reasonable, taking it in the way which he explains himself in? But, whereas you object, *That this will keep Men in Error to the World's end, because such a Council is morally impossible;* it is easie to shew you, that if the *rectifying Council* be impossible, the *General erring Council* is equally impossible; therefore there is no danger coming that way neither. And that such *General Councils* are grown such morally impossible things, we may in a great Measure thank your *Church* for it, which hates as much such a *true rectifying Council* (as you call it) as the *Court* of *Rome* does a *thorough Reformation.* For, all your design is, to perswade Men, that those only are *General Councils*, which have the *Pope's Summons*, and wherein he rules, and, in effect, does all; and to perswade Men to believe the *Decrees* of such *Councils*, is the most effectual way in the World to *unite Men in the belief of Errors to the World's end.* For, as long as the *Pope's* Interest can carry it, to be sure, all *rectifying Councils*, shall be (as you say) *Utopian* too; for he will prevent, if possible, their ever appearing in *Europe.* Therefore all this Discourse of his Lordship doth suppose such a state of the *Church*, as that was in the time of the *Nicene Councils*; and after; when there might be a Liberty of calling such *Councils*, that in case one errs, another might be summoned to reverse it. But this is not to be expected *in fæce Romuli*, in this state of the *Christian World*, that there should be such a *General Council* so called, and so proceeding as he supposes, and therefore there is no such danger of *being united in Error*, by vertue of its Decrees; but if the state of things would bear such a *Council* so decreeing, we might as well think it would bear another to reverse it, if need were, and then his Lordship's Supposition would come to act, that in the interstice of those *Councils*, private Men ought not to oppose the Decrees of the former, but patiently wait till the latter *reverse* them. But, as things are now in the Christian World, his Lordship doth not suppose that any *Council* hath such a Power to oblige, because it calls it self a *General Council*; but a truly *General Council* being, as you say, morally impossible, nothing is left but that the *Church* reform it self by Parts, and wait to give an account of its Proceedings therein, till such a *General Council* as we before described, be assembled in the Christian World. Thus we see, how vain and empty your first Objection is, *That from his Lordship's Opinion, it would follow, that the Church must be united in Error*, which is only the direct consequent of your own Assertion, That Men are bound to believe the *Decrees* of those you call *General Councils to be Infallible.*

Q. 5. Your next great Objection is, *That this Doctrine exposes all to Uncertainties; for, Who shall be Judge, whether it be a lawful Council, and proceeds lawfully? Whether the Errors be fundamental and intolerable or no? Whether there be Scripture and Demonstration against them or no? For, if every Man be Judge,* P. 242, &c. *there can be no Submission to any General Council.* This is the force of the P. 260. &c. many Words, which, in several Places, you spend upon this Subject; and therefore I shall consider them together. I answer therefore, 1. In general, if this be so intolerable an Inconvenience, it is unavoidable upon your own Principles; and therefore it is unreasonable to object that to another, which you cannot quit your self of. For you say, That the *Infallibility of General Councils confirmed by the Pope*, is the best way to end Controversies; but there is not one term in the main Proposition, but is liable to the same Uncertainty which you here object to his Lordship; for, 1. You do not say, that all *Councils* are Infallible, but only *General Councils*, Who then shall be judge, whether the *Council* you would have me believe, be *General* or no?

You

You do not ſay, that all muſt be there to make a *General Council*, but the *Pope's general Summons* is ſufficient: But, *Who muſt be Judge*, whether that be ſufficient or no? You ſay ſo; but, I ſee no Reaſon for it. Muſt you be my *Judge*, or I my own? If I may be my own Judge, ſo muſt every one elſe, and ſo every Man is left to believe what *Councils to be General* he pleaſe himſelf. 2. You ſay, *General Councils are Infallible:* Who muſt be *Judge* of that too? Muſt the *Council* be infallibly believed in it? But that is the thing in *Queſtion.* Muſt the *Pope* be Judge? *But no Man* (you ſay) *is bound to believe him Infallible without the Council.* Muſt the *Scripture* be Judge? But, Who muſt Judge what the *Senſe* of the *Scripture* is? 3. Who muſt be *Judge* in what Senſe, and how far the *Council* is *Infallible?* Who muſt *judge*, how the *Council* comes to be *Infallible* in the *Concluſion*, that was fallible in the *uſe* of the *Means*? And when any Controverſie ariſes concerning the *meaning* of the *Decrees* of the *Council*, Who muſt be *Judge*, which is the Infallible *Senſe* of them? For there is but one *Senſe Infallible*, though the Words may bear many, and unleſs I know which is the *Infallible Senſe*, I am not bound to yield my *aſſent* to it. But, Who muſt decide this? The *Council* cannot; for that leaves no Expoſition with the Decrees. The *Pope* cannot; for he is not *Infallible* without the *Council.* So that ſtill it falls to every Man's private Reaſon, to judge of it. 4. Who muſt be Judge, that the *Pope's Confirmation* is neceſſary to make the Decrees *Infallible*? Not the *Council* without the *Pope*, nor the *Pope* without the *Council*; for, you ſay, *We are not bound to believe them Infallible, but as they are together.* And together they cannot, for that is the Queſtion, *Why not a Council without the Pope's Confirmation, as well as with it*? and, When did *Pope* and *Council* determine, that no *Council* without the *Pope*, is Infallible? but the contrary hath been determined by a *Council*, viz. *that a Council is above the Pope*, and conſequently needs not his Confirmation. So that for all your pretending to end Controverſies, you leave Men at as great Uncertainties as any whatſoever. Being not able to reſolve ſome of the moſt neceſſary Queſtions, in order to the *Churches* Peace, according to your own Principles.

2. I anſwer more particularly, that his Lordſhip's Opinion doth not expoſe near to ſo great *Uncertainties* as yours doth; upon this Reaſon, becauſe your requiring an *internal Aſſent* to the Decrees of *Councils*, and *Infallible Certainty* in all that Men believe, muſt of Neceſſity leave Men in the greateſt *Perplexities*, where you cannot give them that kind of *Certainty* on which they may build their Faith; but, his Lordſhip only requiring *external Obedience* to the Decrees of *Councils*, a far leſs degree of *Certainty* will be ſufficient. That is, ſuch a kind of *Moral Certainty*, as things of that nature are capable of. You ask then, *Who ſhall be Judge, whether a Council were lawfully called, and did lawfully proceed or no*? I anſwer, let every Man be Judge according to the general Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind. If there were ſufficient Authority for calling them together, according to the known Practice of the *Church*; if there was no plain Ground of *Suſpicion* of any *Practices* by the Power of any particular *Prelate*; no Complaints made of it, either in, or after the *Council*; if there be no plain Evidence that it takes any other Rules for its Decrees, but the *Scripture*, then we ſay, They are bound to yield *external Obedience* to them, ſuppoſing the *Council* generally received in the Chriſtian World for a *lawful* and *General Council*. If you ask again, *How ſhould it be known when Errors are manifeſt and intolerable, and when not*? We here appeal to *Scripture* interpreted by the concurrent Senſe of the *Primitive Church*, the *common Reaſon* of mankind (ſuppoſing the *Scripture* to be the *Rule* of *Faith*) the conſent of wiſe and learned Men; which certainly will prevent the Exorbitances and capricious Humours of any phantaſtical *Spi-* §. 6.

rits,

Spirits, which may cry out, That the most received *Truths*, ever since Christianity was in the World, are *intolerable Errors*. If you are resolved yet further to ask, *Who shall be judge what a necessary Reason or demonstration is?* His Lordships tells you, I think plain enough, from *Hooker*, what is understood by it, *viz. such as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent to it.* And, Do you require any other Judge but a Man's own Reason in this Case? But, you say, *others call their Arguments Demonstrations*; but let them submit to this way of Tryal, and they may soon be convinced that they are not. Still you say, *They will not be convinced, but will break the Peace of the Church, supposing they have sufficient Evidence for what they say.* But if men will be unreasonable, who can help it? Can you, with telling them *Councils* are Infallible? I doubt you would hear of more Arguments than you could well satisfie against that presently. We appeal then to the common *Reason* of Mankind, Whether it be not a far more probable Way to end *Controversies*, to perswade men in disputable Matters, to yield *external Obedience* to the *Decrees* of a *lawful general Council*, than to tell them, they are bound to believe whatever they decree to be *infallibly true*? And there-
P. 262. fore you are very much mistaken, *when you say, His Lordship declines the main Question*, which is, *of the necessity of submitting to a living Judge, or a definitive Sentence, in case two Parties, equal for Learning and Integrity, both pretend to equal Evidence for what they say*; for his Lordship doth not deny, but that in such a Case the submitting to a definitive Sentence, may be a reasonable way to end the *Controversie*; but then the Difference between you lies in two things. 1. That you would bind men to *internal Assent to the Decrees of a Council*, as being Infallible; but his Lordship saith, They bind to *external Obedience*, as being the *Supremest Judicatory can be expected in the Church*. 2. You pretend, *That Councils called and confirmed by the Pope, are thus Infallible, and our Supreme Judge in Matters of Faith*; his Lordship justly denies that, and says, That a *Free General Council observing the same Conditions which the first did, is the only equal and indifferent Judge*. So that the Question is not so much, Whether there shall be a *living Judge*? as, Who shall be he? And, How far the definitive *Sentence* binds? And, What is to be done, in case there cannot be a free and indifferent Judge? For in this Case we say, Every *Church* is bound to regard her own Purity and Peace, and, in case of *Corruptions*, to proceed to a *Reformation* of them.

Q. 6. We now come to the remaining *Enquiry*, which is, *Whether your Doctrine, or ours, tends more to the Churches Peace?* For clearing of this, his Lord-
P. 253. ship premises these Things by way of *Considerations*. 1. *That there is no ne-*
P. 254. *cessity of any such Infallibility in the Church, as was in the Apostles.* 2. *That what Infallibility or Authority belongs to the Church, doth primarily reside in the*
P. 256. *whole Body of the Church, and not in a General Council.* 3. *That in case a General Council err, the whole Church hath full Authority to represent her self in another Council, and so to redress what was amiss either practised, or concluded.* And so upon these Principles his Lordship saith, *Here is a sufficient Remedy for what is amiss, and yet no infringing any lawful Authority in the Church; and yet he grants, as the Church of* England *doth, that a general Council may err.* But
P. 257. he saith, *It doth not follow, because the Church may err, therefore she may not govern. For the Church hath not only a Pastoral Power to teach and direct, but a Prætorian also, to control and censure too where Errors or Crimes are against Points fundamental, or of great Consequence.* Thus he represents the Advantages which follow upon his Opinion, after which he comes to the Disadvantages of yours. But we must first consider, what you have to object against what his Lordship hath here delivered. To the first you say nothing,

thing, but that *Stapleton* and *Bellarmine* attribute more *Infallibility* to the *Church*, than his Lordship doth, which is an excellent way to prove the Necessity of it, if you had first proved those two Authors Infallible. To the second, your Answer is more large; for his Lordship to confirm what he said, That the Power and Authority given by Christ, lies in the whole *Church*, produces that saying of S. *Austin*, That S. *Peter did not receive the Keys of the Church, but as sustaining the Person of the Church*; from whence he proves against *Stapleton*, *That it is not to be understood finally only for the good of the Church; but that the primary and formal Right is in the Church. For he that receives a thing in the Person of another, receives it indeed to his good and use, but in his right too.* To this you answer from *Bellarmine*, *That there is a twofold representing or bearing the Person of another, The one Parabolical, and by way of meer Figure and Supposition only; as* Agar *represented the People of the Jews under Bondage of the Law*, &c. *The other historical and real*, viz. *when the Person representing, has right or relation* à parte rei, *in and towards the thing represented, by Virtue whereof it bears the Person of the thing represented: Now S.* Peter, say you, *sustained the Person of the Church in this latter Sense, really and historically, and not parabolically, and in figure*, i. e. *he received the Keys as Head of the Church; though that Reception were ordained for the good of the whole Church.* But, Sir, our Enquiry is not, How many Ways one may imagine a *Representation* to be made, but, What kind of Representation that is, which is suitable to S. *Austin*'s Meaning? That there may be an *Allegorial Representation*, no Body denies; but I cannot imagine, How it can belong to this Place; or, Who ever meant that S. *Peter* stood here for an *Allegory* of the *Church*? And therefore the Members of your Distinction are not apposite. For those who assert, that S. *Peter* did sustain the Person of the *Church*, in his Lordships Sense, do yet acknowledge that he did it *historicè*, and not *parabolicè*, as you speak, *i. e.* the *Donation* was *really* made to him; but then the Question is, In what *Right* or *Capacity* it was made to him, Whether in his *personal* or *representative* Capacity? For these are the two only proper Members of a distinction here. St. *Austin* saith, not only in that Place, but in very many others, that S. *Peter* did sustain the *Person of the the Church, when Christ said to him, I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*; Now the Question is, In what Sense he sustained the *Person* of the *Church*? You say, In his *own Right as Head of the Church*; We say, As a *publick Person* representing the *Church*, not *parabolically* (for that is no sustaining the *Person* at all) but *really* and *historically*. And that S. *Austin* means, As a *publick Person*, appears by the other Expressions in the Places cited, that he did *universam significare Ecclesiam*, signifie the whole Church; and that those things which are spoken of *Peter*, *Non habent illustrem intellectum nisi cum referuntur ad Ecclesiam cujus ille agnoscitur in figurâ gestâsse personam, Have no clear sense, but when they are referred to the Church, whose Person he did bear.* Can you say this *of a King, who receives the Keys of a Town, whereof he takes Possession for himself, though it be for the good of the Kingdom; that he signifies the whole Kingdom in it, and that it cannot have any clear sense, but when it is applied to the Kingdom which he represents?* No, this cannot be; for the King takes Possession in his own *full Right*, and it is not the *Possession*, but the *Administration*, which is referred properly to the *good* of the *Kingdom*. But this might be properly said of a *Duke* of *Venice*, that he takes *Possession* of a *Town* in the Person of the *State*, and that the proper Sense is, that the *State* took *Possession*, and he only representing it. So that the full Right lies in the *Body* of the *State*, but he as *chief Member* represents the whole. And this is that which S. *Austin* means, when

P. 266.

Aug. de Agone Christiano, cap. 30.

De Pontif. l. 1. *c.* 12.

Aug. in Psal. 108. *in Johan. tr.* 124. *Serm.* 30. *de diverf. Retract. l.* 1. *c.* 21.

when he saith, That S. *Peter* represented the *Church*, *propter primatum*, *for the Primacy* which he had amongst the *Apostles*, *i. e.* such a *Primacy of order*, whereby he was fittest to represent the whole *Church*. For it is impossible to conceive that he should mean that S. *Peter* should receive this as *Head of the Church*, when you acknowledge that he was not *Head of the Church*, till after the *Keys were given him*. For, you say, The *Performance* of *Christ's Promise*, in making him *Head of the Church*, was not till after his *Resurrection*. But, Will you say, the *Church* had no Power of the *Keys* till then; and then only *finally* too, and not *formally*? What became then of the Power of the *Keys* at S. *Peter*'s death, if only *formally* in him, and not in the *Church*? What becomes of them at the *death* of every *Pope*? Will you say, as *Bellarmine* doth, that *Christ* takes them, and gives them to his Successor? But he must be sure to wait till the *Cardinals* agree, To whom he must give them. Nothing then could be further from S. *Austin*'s Meaning, than that S. *Peter* received the *Keys*, as *Head of the Church*, and so, that he represented the Church only *finally*; whereas his Expressions carry it, that he means the *formal Right* of them was conveyed to the *Church*, and that S. *Peter* was only a *publick Person*, to receive them in the name of the *Church*. But, whatever S. *Austin*'s Meaning was, the strength of his Lordship's Assertion doth not stand or fall with that; for there are Arguments sufficient besides to prove, that the *Authority* for *governing* the *Church*, was not committed *formally* to S. *Peter*, much less to any pretended Successor, but that it primarily and formally resides in the whole *Body* of the *Church*. And, were that the thing to be here disputed, you must not think to take it for granted, that if the *Keys* were given personally to S. *Peter*, by them was meant the *Supreme Authority* of governing the *Church* exclusively of the other *Apostles*.

P. 267. To the third *Consideration*, you answer, *That in case a general Council err, there can be no redress for Error in Faith*; *for if one Council may err, so may another, and a third, and a fourth*, &c. This indeed is very suitable to your Doctrine from the beginning, that a Man can be *certain* of nothing but what it is impossible should be otherwise. I hope you are certain your self, you do not err; but I suppose you do not think it *impossibly* you should: So, although we do not think it impossible, a *Council* should err, yet we may be certain it doth not: and, supposing it should, we do not say, It is impossible that a *Council* should not *err*, so that another *Council* may correct the Error of the former. And doubtless Men may be certain of it too; if, as his Lordship saith, *plain Scripture*, *and evident Demonstration* be brought against the former Error. But these are strange Doctrines, that because a *Council* may err, therefore a *Council* can never afford Remedy against Inconveniencies. For, one great Inconveniency is, the *breaking* the *Church's Peace*: that, is remedied by the *Council's Authority*; another is, *Error in Faith*, that may be remedied by another *Council*: *No*, say you, *for that may err too*; but, Doth it follow that it *must err*? Or, Is it probable that it should *err*? If the former *Error* be so discovered, and the Council so proceed as his Lordship supposes. For your other

P. 268. Difficulty *about the calling another general Council*, I have answered it already, when I shewed, what we meant by a *general Council*, and when it was *lawfully call'd*. When you after add, *That the Church never represented her self in another Council but where the former Council was unlawful*; *and instance in the* Councils *of* Ariminum *and* Ephesus: You say the same which his Lordship doth, for these Councils were therefore accounted unlawful because *erroneous* and *factious*, and he never asserts the Necessity of calling a *new* Council, but in those two Cases. But if you would have us account none such, but whom

whom you do, you muſt excuſe us till we ſee greater Reaſon for it than we do yet; and ſo likewiſe for what follows, that the *Councils which rectified the Errors of thoſe were called by the Pope's Authority, as that of* Trent *and others were*, which to ſpeak mildly is a groſs Untruth.

You urge from his Lordſhips granting, *That the Church hath a Prætorian Power to controul and cenſure too, where Errors or Crimes are againſt Points Fundamental or of great Conſequence*; that *therefore he and all Proteſtants are juſtly cenſured by the Roman Church for oppoſing thoſe Doctrines which are with her Fundamental and of great Conſequence.* But ſtill there is no Difference with you between the *Roman Church* and the *Catholick*; between *Papal Councils*, and *Free and General*; between what ſhe judges Fundamental, and what all are bound to judge ſo: If you prove then, that we are bound to rely only on the Judgment of your Church, your Conſequence is good; but otherwiſe it is tyed with a Rope of Sand, and therefore we do not fear the *Laſhes* of it. And the ſame Fault runs through your ſubſequent Diſcourſe, in which you ſuppoſe the *Church infallible in all ſhe Propounds*, which you know is conſtantly denied, and hath been at large diſproved in our *Firſt Part.* For, the ground of your *Reſolution of Faith being removed*, I ſee the Fabarck of your Church falls down with it. For take but away your Pretence of *Infallibility*, and your confounding the *Catholick and Roman Church*; all the reſt Moulders, as not being able to ſtand without them. But that is ſtill your way, if any thing be ſaid of the *Catholick Church*, we muſt preſently underſtand it of yours; ſo that it cannot be ſaid in any Senſe *that the* Church *is without ſpot or wrinkle*, but by you it muſt be underſtood preſently of the *Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Church univerſally received as a Matter of Faith:* But till you prove not only your two former Aſſertions, but that St. *Auſtin* underſtood thoſe Words ever in that Senſe, your Vindication of that Place in him concerning it, will appear utterly impertinent to your Purpoſe. And his Lordſhip's Aſſertion may ſtill ſtand good, *That the Church on Earth is not any freer from Wrinkles in Doctrine and Diſcipline, than ſhe is from Spots in Life and Converſation.*

P. 269.

Ibid.

Having thus vindicated his Lordſhip's Way from the Objections you raiſed againſt it, we muſt now conſider how well you vindicate your own from the *unreaſonableneſs* he charges it with, in ſeveral Particulars, 1. *That if we ſuppoſe a general Council Infallible, and it prove not ſo, but that an Error in Faith be concluded; the ſame erring Opinion, which makes it think it ſelf Infallible, makes the Error of it irrevocable, and ſo leaves the Church without Remedy.* To this you anſwer, *Grant falſe Antecedents and falſe Premiſes enough, and what Abſurdities will not be conſequent, and fill up the Concluſion?* But you clearly miſtake the preſent Buſineſs; which is not, Whether *Councils* be Infallible or no? But, Whether Opinion be liable to greater Inconveniencies, that which aſſerts that they may, or that they cannot err? Will you have your Suppoſition of the *Infallibily of Councils* taken for a *firſt Principle*, or a thing as true as the *Scriptures*? So you would ſeem indeed, *by the ſuppoſing the Scriptures not to be God's Word*, which you joyn as the *Parallel, to the ſuppoſing general Councils fallible.* But will you ſay the one is as evident and built on as good Reaſon, and as much agreed on among Chriſtians as the other is? I ſuppoſe, you will not; and therefore it was very abſurd and unreaſonable to ſay, *Suppoſing the Word of God were not ſo, Errors would be irrevocable, as if general Councils were ſuppoſed Infallible and proved not ſo.* But this is a Queſtion you grant to be diſputable among Chriſtians, and will you not give us leave to make a Suppoſition that it may prove not ſo? You muſt conſider, we are now enquiring into the *Conveni-*

§. 8.

P. 258.

P. 269.

P. 270.

encies of theſe two *Opinions*, and in that Caſe it is neceſſary to make ſuch ſuppoſitions: And let any reaſonable man judge what Opinion can be more pernicious to the *Church* than yours is, ſuppoſing it not to be true: For then it will be neceſſary for Men to aſſent to the *groſſeſt Errors*, as the moſt *Divine* and *Infallible Truths*: And there can be no Remedy imagin'd for the redreſs of them. If then the Inconvenience of admitting it be ſo great, Men had need look well to the Grounds on which it is built. And I cannot ſee any reaſon men can have to admit any *Infallible proponent in Matters of Faith* to the *Church*, but on as great and as clear Evidence, as the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* had, that they were ſent from *God*. For the Danger may be as great to believe that to be *Infallible* which is not, as not to believe that to be *Infallible* which is: For the believing an Error to be a *Divine Truth*, may be as dangerous to the *Souls* of Men, as the not believing ſomething which is really revealed by *God*. But to be ſure, thoſe who ſee no reaſon to believe a *General Council* to be *Infallible*, cannot be obliged to *aſſent* to *Errors* propounded by it; but ſuch who believe it *Infallible* muſt, whatever the Errors be, ſwallow them down, without queſtioning the Truth of them. And it argues how conſcious you are of the Falſeneſs of your *Principles*, that you are ſo loth to have them examined, or ſo much as a Suppoſition made that they ſhould not prove true? Whereas *Truth* always invites Men to the moſt accurate ſearch into it. We ſee the *Apoſtles* bid Men *ſearch*, whether the things they ſpake were *true* or no; and thoſe are moſt commended who did it moſt, and I hope Men were as much bound to believe them *Infallible* as *General Councils*. But we ſee how unreaſonable you are, you would obtrude ſuch things upon Mens Faith, which muſt lead them into unavoidable *Errors* if falſe, and yet not allow Men the liberty of Examination, whether they be *true* or no. But ſuch Proceedings are ſo far from advancing your Cauſe, that nothing can more prejudice it among rational and inquiſitive Men.

His Lordſhip for the clearing this, proceeds to an Inſtance of an *Error*
P. 259. defined by one of your *General Councils*, viz. *Communion in one kind*; but that we ſhall reſerve the Diſcuſſion of, to the enſuing Chapter; which is purpoſely allotted for the diſcovery of thoſe *Errors* which have been defined by ſuch as you call *General Councils*. Therefore I proceed.

§. 9. 2. His Lordſhip ſaith, *Your Opinion is yet more unreaſonable, becauſe no*
P. 260. *Body-collective, whenſoever it aſſembled it ſelf, did ever give more power to the repreſenting Body of it, than a binding Power upon it ſelf and all particulars; nor ever did it give this Power otherwiſe, than with this Reſervation in Nature, that it would call again, and reform, and, if need were, abrogate any Law, or Ordinance upon juſt Cauſe made evident that the repreſenting Body had failed in Truſt, or Truth. And this Power no Body-collective, eccleſiaſtical or civil, can put out of it ſelf, or give away to a Parliament, or Council, or call it what you*
P. 272. *will that repreſents it.* To this again you anſwer, *This is only to ſuppoſe and take for granted, that a General Council hath no Authority, but what is meerly delegate from the Church Univerſal which it repreſents.* I grant, this is ſuppoſed in it, and this is all which the Nature of a repreſentative Body doth imply; if you ſay, there is more than that, you are bound to prove it. Yes, ſay you, *We maintain its Authority to be of Divine Inſtitution, and when lawfully aſſembled to act by Divine Right, and not meerly by Deputation and conſent of the Church.* But if all the Proof you have for it, be only that which you refer us to in the precedent *Chapter*, the palpable Weakneſs of it for any
P. 261. ſuch Purpoſe hath been there fully laid open. His Lordſhip ſaith, *That the Power which a Council hath to order, ſettle and define Differences ariſing concerning Faith*

Faith, it hath not by any Immediate Institution from Christ, but it was prudently taken up by the Church from the Apostle's Example. So that to hold Councils to this end, is apparent Apostolical Tradition written; but the Power which Councils have, is from the whole Catholick Church, whose Members they are, and the Churches power from God. You say, *True it is, the calling such Assemblies was taken up, and hath for its Pattern the Example of the Apostles,* Act. 15. *yet surely there is little doubt to be made, but the Apostles had both Direction and Precept too, for doing it so often as just occasion required, from Christ himself.* The whole force of which Answer lies in those well placed Words, *Surely there is little doubt to be made*; for as to any thing of Reason, you never offer at it. Just such another of *Bellarmine*'s *sine dubio's* comes after; *Though a General Council be the Church representative, and do not meet, or assemble together* hic & nunc, *but by order and deputation from man; yet it follows not, but the Power and Authority by which they act when they are met may be from God, as doubtless it is.* Can any Man have the face to question, Whether the Authority of *general Councils* be of *Divine Institution* or no, when you say, *Yes surely, there is no doubt to be made of it, doubtless it is*? We do not question, as you would seem to imply afterwards, *Whether the People or the Pastours have right to send to general Councils*, but what ground you have to assert, that *general Councils are an immediate Divine Institution.* But I must needs say, I never saw any thing affirmed oftner, and offered to be proved less, than that is here; and yet as though you had done it invincibly you triumphantly proceed; *General Councils then, are a principal and necessary part* P. 273. *of that Ecclesiastical Hierarchy which Christ instituted for the Government of his Church, and not an humane Expedient only, taken up by the Church her self meerly upon prudential Considerations, as the Bishop will needs conceive.* It strangely puzzles me to find out any thing that Particle *then* relates to; and after all my search can find nothing, but *surely, without doubt, and doubtless.* I pray Sir, think not so meanly of us, that we should take these for Arguments or Demonstrations: Deal fairly with us, and if we fall by the *force* of Reason, we yield our selves up to you. But you are very much deceived, if you think these things are taken for Proofs with us: we can easily discern the weakness of your Cause through the most confident Affirmations. If you had brought any *Law* of *Christ*, appointing that *general Councils* should be in the *Church*, any *Apostolical Precept*, prescribing or giving Directions concerning them, you had done something; but, not so much as to offer at a Proof, and yet conclude it as confidently as if it were impossible to resist the force of your Demonstrations, is an Evidence, that either you know your Cause to be weak, or suppose us to be so. Much such another Discourse is that which follows, wherein you pretend to give a Reason, *Why what is defined by one Council in point of Doctrine, cannot be reversed by another.* Which is, *because the true Christian Faith is* ex natura P. 273. rei *unchangeable, that it admits not of yea and nay, but only yea; that it is always the same, that it must stand without Alteration for ever, nay, that it is to be invariable and admit no change.* All these Expressions we have in one *Paragraph*, and, for all that I see, are the greatest Strength of it. But what is it you mean by all this? Do you think we could not understand what you meant by the *unchangeableness of Christian Faith*, without so many diversified Expressions of it? And what follows now from all this? *That one Council cannot repeal the Decrees of another?* How so? was not the *Faith of Christ* as *unchangeable* in the time of the *Arrian Councils*, as it is now? And yet then one *Council* repealed the Decrees of others, in point of Doctrine; and yet by that nothing was derogated from the *Institution* or *Honour of*

Christ, by such a reversing those Decrees. Though the *Faith*, *i. e.* *The Doctrine of Christ*, be always the same, Doth it thence follow, then Men shall always believe all this unalterable Doctrine? If so, how came *Arrianism* to overspread the *Church*? How came six hundred *Bishops* at the *Council* of *Ariminum* to be deceived in a *Doctrine of Faith*, by your own Confession? It is therefore a profound mistake, to infer from the Fallibility of *General Councils*, the *Alteration* of the *Faith of Christ*. The *Faith of Christ* is founded on a surer bottom than the *Decrees* of *Councils*, *though all Men are Liars God is true, and Christ the same Yesterday, to Day, and for Ever.* But of this more afterwards.

§. 10. P. 274, 275. P. 261. You would seem to argue more pertinently in the following Pages against his Lordship's Opinion: for you say, *He says and unsays the same; and what he seems to attribute to General Councils in one Proposition, he takes away in another.* That which his Lordship says, is, *That the Definitions of a General Council are binding to all Particulars, and it self; but yet so, that they cannot bind the whole Church from calling again, and in the after calls upon just cause to order, and, if need be, to abrogate former Acts. And after adds, And because the whole Church can meet no other way, the Council shall remain the Supream, external, living, temporary Ecclesiastical Judge of all Controversies. Only the whole Church, and she alone, hath Power when Scripture or Demonstration is found, and peaceably tendered to her, to represent her self again in a new Council, and in it to order what was amiss.* Now we must consider what we find Contradictious and repugnant to themselves in these Words: Three things, if I mistake not, the main of this Charge may be reduced to, 1. *That Men should be bound to that which Scripture and Demonstration be against*; But this is very easily answered, for his Lordship doth not say, Men are bound to *believe* it, but not so to oppose it as to break the Peace of the *Church* by it. 2. *That another Council cannot be call'd without Opposition to the other*: This his Lordship prevented, by supposing that the *just Reasons* against the Decrees of the former *Council* ought to be *peaceably tendred* to the *Church*; but no boisterous Opposition to be made against it. 3. *To what purpose should another Council be called, if the whole Church be satisfied that there is Scripture and Demonstration against the Decrees of the former*? But, 1. His Lordship supposes there may *Scripture* and *Demonstration* be, where the whole *Church* is not satisfied; and therefore there may be necessity of calling another *Council.* 2. That the *Council* may free all those who may suppose themselves still bound not to *oppose* the former Error. 3. That no *erroneous Decree* of a *Council*, may remain unrepealed in the *Church*: that so no erroneous Person may challenge such a Decree of a *Council*, as a ground for his Opposition to the Doctrine of the *Church*. And where now lies any such Appearance of Contradiction in his Lordship's Words?

§. 11. P. 262. 3. The last thing his Lordship chargeth your way with *unreasonableness* in, is, *That you do not only make the Definition of a General Council, but the Sentence of the Pope Infallible*; *nay, more Infallible than it. For, any General Council may err with you, if the Pope confirm it not. So belike this Infallibility rests not in the representative Body, the Council, nor in the whole Body the Church, but in your Head of the Church, the Pope of* Rome. *And if this be so, To what end such a trouble for a General Council? or, Wherein are we nearer to Unity,* P. 275. *if the Pope confirm it not?* To this you answer, 1. *That a General Council is not held by you to be Infallible at all, unless it involve the Pope, or his Confirmation; and so there is but one Infallibility*, viz. *of the Pope presiding in, and confirming of the Votes of a General Council.* 2. *You confess there are two different Opinions among you; the first and more common is, that the Pope, even without*

without a General Council, is Infallible in his Definitions of Faith, when he teaches the whole Church; the second is, that he is not Infallible in his Definitions, save only were he defines in, and with, a General Council. Now the Bishop (you say) *takes no notice of the second Opinion, but only of the first, as though that were the Opinion of all Catholick Doctors. But, for your part, you will not meddle much with any matters of private Opinion or Dispute, and therefore you will briefly pass over what his Lordship saith further, and only correct some Mistakes of his.* But whereas you pretend it only necessary to believe, that *Pope and Council together are Infallible, for this all Catholicks are agreed in; but, whether the Pope be Infallible without a Council or no, you leave it as matter of Dispute.* I shall manifest, how great a Cheat you put upon the World by this Assertion, in these two Things, 1. *That there is no such Agreement among your selves in this common Principle, as you pretend.* 2. *That from the making the Pope's Confirmation necessary to the Infallibility of the Council, you must make the Pope Infallible without a Council.* 1. Whereas you pretend such a consent among all *Catholicks* in this common Principle, *That Pope and Council are Infallible together*, it is evident that there is no such thing. For, 1. Some among you have asserted, that the *representative Body of the Church* is not at all the *Subject* of *Infallibility*, but the *diffusive*. For *Occham* contends at large, *That the Privilege of Infallibility, belongs only to the whole Militant Church; and neither to the Pope, nor General Council, nor body of the Clergy.* And so likewise doth *Petrus de Alliaco*, *Cusanus*, *Antoninus* of *Florence*, *Panormitan*, *Nicolaus de Clemangis*, *Franciscus Mirandula*, and others, whose Words you may find at large in some of your Writers, and therefore I forbear repeating them. 2. Some assert, that *Councils* are no further *Infallible*, than they adhere to *Universal Tradition*; and you cannot be ignorant, who they are at this Day among you, who assert this Doctrine. 3. Some further say, That *Councils are in themselves Infallible*, and therefore must be so, whether the *Pope* confirm them or no. And this Opinion, however now you say, it be not so *common* as the other, yet it is certain, that before the *Council* of *Lateran* under *Leo* 10. it was much the more common Opinion, as appears by the *Councils* of *Constance* and *Basil.* And, that there is an irreconcileable Difference between the *Authors* of this Opinion, and those who make the *Pope's* Confirmation necessary to the *Infallibility* of a *General Council*, I shall prove out of *Bellarmin* himself, from the state of the Question, and the Arguments he urges against it. *Bellarmin* tells us, *The first occasion of this Controversie, was about the Deposition of Popes*, viz. *whether the Pope might against his consent be judged, condemned, and deposed by the Council:* and therefore, saith he, *They are mistaken, who think the Question is, Whether the Council with the Pope be greater than the Pope without a Council? for, it cannot be conceived he should give consent to his own Deposition.* And this he proves *from the Council at* Basil, *who defined their Council to be above the Pope, at that time, when neither the Pope nor his Legates were present.* And this *Council* of *Basil* in their *Synodal Epistle*, declare a *General Council*, *as representing the Universal Church to be Infallible*, when at the same time they assert, *That Popes have fallen into Heresie.* Now, Can any one possibly imagine, these Men should believe the *Pope's Confirmation* to be necessary to the *Council's Infallibility*, who suppose the *Pope* may be an *Heretick* at the same time, in which a *Council* may be Infallible? And when they assert it to belong to the *Council* only to pronounce, Whether the *Pope* be guilty of *Heresie* or no? Those therefore

Occham Dialog. p. 1. l. 5. cap. 25, 29, 31. Cameracensis quæst. Vesp. art. 3. ad liter. O & P.
Cusan. Concord. Cathol. l. 2. c. 3.
Antonin. Summ. Summarum, p. 3. Tit. 23. c. 2. sect. 6.
Panormitan. decret. p. 1. l. 1. Tit. de elect. cap significasti.
Clemangis disput. de Concil. Gener.
Mirandula de fide & ordine credend. Theorem. 4. &c.

Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 13.

therefore who contend for the *Council's Authority* above the *Pope*, do not at all look at the *Pope's* Confirmation, as necessary to make the Decrees *Infallible*; though some of them may, to make *Canonical*. For there lies one of your Fallacies; because they look on the *Pope* as *Ministerial Head* of the *Church*, therefore to make *Canons* to be valid, they may judge it in most cases necessary that the *Pope* confirm the Decrees; but yet, they do not suppose this *Confirmation* doth at all make them *Infallible*; but, whether the *Pope* had confirmed them or no, they had been *Infallible* however. So that you cannot say, *That it is a Principle of Faith among you, that Pope and Council together are Infallible*; for those of this Opinion make it a *Principle of Faith*, that the *Council* in it self is *Infallible*, and consequently, whether it be confirmed by the *Pope* or no. And therefore *Bellarmin* saith, Their Opinion is, *That in case the Pope be dead, deposed, or refuseth to come to the Council, the Council is not at all the less perfect, but that it hath full Power to make Definitions in matters of Faith.* And when he comes to urge against this Opinion, one of his *Arguments* is, that from hence it follows, *That the Council would not at all need the Pope's Confirmation*; and another, *That Councils without the Pope may err in Decrees of Faith*; for which he instanceth in *the Councils of Sirmium, Milan, Ariminum, Ephesus, &c. Neither*, saith he, *can it be answered, that these Councils erred, because they were unlawful Councils; for the most of them wanted nothing but the Pope's consent, and the second Ephesine Council was just such another as that of* Basil. From which Disputation of *Bellarmin*, it is both clear, that those who make *Councils* above the *Pope*, do not judge the *Pope's* Confirmation necessary; and those who judge it necessary, do not suppose the *Council* Infallible without it. So that you are either deceived your self, or would deceive others, when you would make them believe that there is but one *Infallibility* asserted by you, whereas nothing can be more evident, than that two distinct *Subjects* of *Infallibility* are asserted in your *Church*, some placing it in the *Council* without the *Pope*, and others in the *Pope*, and not in the *Council*, and neither of them absolutely and formally in the *Pope* and *Council* together.

De Concil. l. 2. c. 14.

c. 16.

§ 12. 2. I shall therefore more fully shew, *That those who make the Pope's Confirmation necessary, do really place the Infallibility in the Pope, and not in the Council*; and that from these things, 1. Because they in Terms assert, *That though nothing be wanting to a Council*, but the *Pope's Confirmation, it may err, if the Pope confirm it not.* And this we produced *Bellarmin's* Assertion for already, giving that as the only reason, why those *Councils* did err, which wanted nothing but that. Nay, he elsewhere asserts, *Not only that General Councils may err, though the Pope confirm them not, but although the Pope's Legates be present, and consent with the Council, yet if they do not follow the certain Instruction of the Pope, the Council may err.* And; Can any one then possibly conceive, that the Infallibility lies any where but in the *Pope*? 2. You assert, *That all the Power and Infallibility which is in the Church, is formally in the Pope, and only finally in the Church, because it is for the good of the Church*; this I suppose you have not forgot, since you told us, that S. *Peter sustained the Person of the Church* historice, *and not* parabolice, *and that the fulness of all Ecclesiastical Power was in him as Head of the Church*: If this be true, as there you assert it confidently, whatever you pretend here, you are bound to defend, that all the *Infallibility* in the *Council* comes wholly from the *Pope*; for I know you will not place *Infallibility* in one, and the *fulness of Ecclesiastical Power* in another. 3. Because *the main ground* of the *reprobating Councils lies in the Pope's dissent.* So that *Councils* which in all other Particulars are accounted lawful and general,

L. 2. de Concil. c. 11.

[P. 266.

general, yet if any thing paſſed diſpleaſing in them to the *Pope*, ſo far they are *reprobated*; as the Proceedings of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, in reference to the *Popes*, do ſufficiently teſtifie. For, although they were the ſame Perſons, acting with equal *Freedom* in thoſe, as in other things, yet when they came to touch any thing of the *Pope's Intereſt*, then, becauſe the *Pope* doth not conſent, ſo far they were not *Infallible*. By which it is plain, that, though the *Council* ſtands for a *ſhew* and *blind* to the World, all the *Infallibility* lies wholly in the *Pope*. And by this means, to be ſure, the *Pope* ſhall never receive any hurt by *General Councils*; for if he pleaſes, the *Council* ſhall either be approved or rejected, or partly approved, and partly rejected; or neither approved, nor rejected; for of all theſe ſorts *Bellarmin* tells us *Councils* are: which in ſhort is, The *Councils* which make for the *Pope's* turn, are *Infallible*, but none other. And therefore *Bellarmin*, very conſonantly to his Principles, ſays expreſly, *Totam firmitatem Conciliorum legitimorum eſſe à Pontifice, non partim à Pontifice, partim à Concilio; The whole ſtrength of lawful Councils depends wholly on the Pope, and not partly on the Pope, and partly on the Council.* And if their *Firmneſs* doth, their *Infallibility* muſt do ſo too. This is not a meer private Opinion of his, but that which doth neceſſarily follow, from the making the *Pope's* Confirmation neceſſary to the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*. Although therefore you would fain put off this as a matter of Diſpute among your ſelves; yet it can be no matter of Diſpute any more, than, Whether the Decrees of *Councils*, as confirmed by the *Pope*, be Infallible or no? And therefore all that his Lordſhip objects, falls upon all ſuch who aſſert this: Whereof the firſt which you mention is, *That then the Council is called but only in effect, to hear the Pope give his Sentence in more State.* To which you anſwer, *That the Objection hath the ſame Force againſt the Council called in the Apoſtles time*, viz. *that it was done, only to hear S.* Peter *pronounce his Sentence in more State.* Neither had it been any more, if the Infallibility of the *Council* had only depended on S. *Peter's* Sentence; but I hope you will not deny the reſt of the *Apoſtles* to have been as *Infallible* as S. *Peter* was. But you anſwer, 2. *That the Pope being to uſe all means morally requiſite to find out the Truth; the Council is called really to help and aſſiſt the Pope; and the Advice of the Council is a neceſſary* Medium *to his Holineſs, whereby to make a full Inſpection into the Matters he is to define.* But all this only confirms what his Lordſhip ſaith, *That it is for his giving Sentence in more State*; for the *Council* is only a ſubſervient *Means*, and contributes nothing at all to the *Infallibility* of the *Sentence*. But, you ſay, *They are a neceſſary Medium.* 1. Then the *Pope* cannot define any matter of Faith without a *General Council*. Which, all who aſſert that Opinion, utterly deny; for they ſay, The *Pope* may define Matters of *Faith* without a *General Council*; and *Bellarmin* ſaith, *That the State of the Church, without General Councils (which was for three hundred Years) might have continued ſo to the Worlds End; and therefore it was neceſſary there ſhould be a living Judge, whoſe Infallibility ſhould not depend upon any Council:* And elſewhere he ſays, *That if ſeven Hereſies have been condemned by ſeven General Councils; more than a Hundred have been condemned without, by the Pope and Provincial Councils.* 2. Though the *Pope* muſt uſe all moral Means, yet, Why muſt a *General Council* be that *neceſſary Medium?* Why may not a *Provincial*, or leſſer *Council* ſerve turn? And ſo *Bellarmine* tells you, it would; he ſaith, indeed *ſome kind of Council is neceſſary*, magnum aut parvum, unum vel plura, prout ipſe judicaverit, *great or little, more or leſs, as the Pope ſhall judge fitting*; ſo that ſtill *a General Council* is but a *piece of State*, for all *moral means* might be uſed without one. 3. What uſe are theſe *moral Means* for? to enable

De Pontif. Rom. l. 4. c. 3.

Ibid.

De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 3.

De Concil. l. 1 c. 10.

Ibid. c. 11.

enable him to pass a right *Judgment*, or no? If they be, then the *Pope* is bound to pronounce according to the Decree of the *Council*, and so it will not be in his Power, not to confirm it; if not, What do these moral Means signifie? No more, than the *Crucifix Pope Innocent* shewed to *Monsieur de Saint-Amour*; *Before which*, he told him, *he kneeled down to take at the feet thereof his Resolution, according to the Inspiration given to him by the Holy Spirit, whose Assistance was promised to him, and could not fail him.* We see, the *Pope* understood his *Infallibility* better, than to make use of such moral Means as *Councils* are; he knew his *Infallibility* came not that way, and therefore he took the more likely Course to receive his *Inspiration* from Heaven, by taking his Resolution at the feet of a *Crucifix*. And this he called, *his Council in matters of Faith*: And yet, if we believe him, he did as much want all *moral means* for finding out the *Truth*, as another; since he so ingenuously confessed at another Audience, *That he was old and had never studied Divinity.* But, What need he to do it, that could so easily be *inspired*, by *kneeling at the feet of a Crucifix*? Your Doctrine then would not be very well taken at *Rome*, that *general Councils* are a *necessary Medium to his Holiness*, in order to the Definition of Matters of Faith. No more would your following Distinction in Vindication of *Stapleton*, *That though the Pope acquires no new Power, or certainty of Judgment by the Presence of a General Council, yet there is something thereby, which conduceth to the due Exercise of that Power*: So that it must be an Usurpation or *undue Exercise of Power*, for the *Pope* to offer to define without a *general Council*. I know not what Liberty you have to write these things among us; but if you were at *Rome*, you durst not venture to do it. Your saying, that *Bellarmine* only says, *That the firmness of a Council in regard of us, depends wholly on the Pope's Confirmation*, argues, you had very little to say: For, What *firmness* hath a *Council* at all in this Dispute, but in regard of us; since you look on Men as obliged to believe the Decrees of it *Infallible*? And if the Decrees had any *Infallibility* from the *Council*, that might make them firm in regard of us, as well as the *Pope*. But you object to your self, *That if the Pope be Infallible without the Council, and the Council subject to Error without the Pope, it must needs follow, that all the Infallibility of General Councils proceeds from the Pope only; not partly from the Pope, and partly from the Council.* To which you answer, *That the Assertors of that Opinion* (of whom you must be one, if you know what you say) *may say, that Christ hath made two Promises to his Church, the one to assist her Soveraign Head and Pastor to make him Infallible, another to assist general Councils to make them so.* But, What need this latter, if the former be well proved? For if the Head be *Infallible* by Virtue of a *Promise* from *Christ*, he must be Infallible, whether in *Council*, or out of it. And therefore it is a ridiculous Shift to say, The *Pope* hath one Promise to make him Infallible in a General Council; another to make him so out of it. But I commend you, that since you thought one would not hold, you would have two Strings for the Pope's Infallibility. And it is but adding a third Promise to the Church in general, and then your threefold Cord may be surely Infallible.

Journal of Mr. *de Saint Amour*. part. 3. chap. 4. p. 78.

Journal. part 3. chap. 12. p. 120.

P. 277.

Ibid.

§. 13. P. 278. You give many Reasons (but none so convincing as Experience) *Why the Pope's should not be Impeccable*; and, if you search Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason, you may find as much, why they should not be *Infallible*. For that of the necessity of one, and not the other for the Church, is of your own devising, it having been sufficiently proved, that the Certainty of Faith doth not at all depend upon the *Popes*, or your *Churches*, or *Council's Infallibility*. And it seems still very strange to all who know the Doctrine and Promises of Christianity, and that the Promotion of *Holiness* is the great Design

deſign of it, and that *Faith* ſignifies nothing without *Obedience*, and that the *Spirit* of *God* is a *Spirit* of *Holineſs*, as well as Truth, that you dare challenge ſuch an aſſiſtance of the *Divine Spirit*, as may make your *Popes* Infallible, who have led Lives quite contrary to the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*. *Nay, ſuch Lives*, as his Lordſhip ſaith, *as no Epicurean Monſter, ſtoried out to the World, hath out-gone them in Senſuality, or other groſs Impiety, if their own Hiſtorians be true.* P. 263.

Your Vindication of *Pope* Liberius *his ſubmitting his Judgment to* Athanaſius, *becauſe the Pope had paſſed no Definition* ex Cathedra *in the Buſineſs*, Ibid. hath no Strength at all, unleſs you firſt prove, that the *Pope's Definitions ex Cathedrâ*, were held *Infallible* then, which none would ever believe that read the Paſſage, which his Lordſhip cites out of *Liberius his Epiſtles to Athanaſius*. For, as he ſaith, The *Pope complemented exceeding low, that would ſubmit his unerring Judgment, to be commanded by* Athanaſius, *who he well knew could err*. Whether S. *Ambroſe* in his *Epiſtle* meddles with any *doctrinal Definitions*, or only with ſome *Difficulties* which that Year happened about the *Obſervation* of *Eaſter*, (the *fourteenth* of the *firſt Month*, falling on the *Lord's Day*) is not very material to our purpoſe. But that it was ſomething elſe beſides *Aſtronomical Definitions* (which I know not what S. *Ambroſe*'s Excellency was in) might eaſily appear, if you had read the *Epiſtle*. So that you might have ſpared your large Account of the *Paſchal Letters* ſent by the *Biſhops* of *Alexandria* about the keeping of *Eaſter* (which are no great Novelties to ſuch, who are at all acquainted with *Antiquity*) and given us a fuller Account, why in ſuch a matter of *Diſpute* about the right of the Day to be kept that Year, the *Roman Biſhops* ſhould not rather have ſtood to the *Pope's* Definition, than write to S. *Ambroſe*, if it had been then taken for granted, that the *Pope* was Infallible. But I might as well have paſſed by this Teſtimony of S. *Ambroſe*, as you do that of *Lyra*, which is ſo expreſs for the Erring and *Apoſtatizing* of ſeveral *Popes*, that you thought the beſt Anſwer to it, were to let it alone. However you come off with the Story of *Peter Lombard* (which is not of that Conſequence to require any further Examination of the Truth of it) I am ſure you are hard put to it, in the caſe of *Honorius*; when you deny, *that* Honorius *did really maintain the Monothelites Hereſie, and excuſe the Councils Sentence, by ſaying, it was only in caſe of Mis-information.* Since it manifeſtly appears by the *ſixth Synod*, *Action.* 13. that they condemned his *Epiſtle* written to *Sergius*, as containing heretical and pernicious Doctrine in it. And in the *ſeventh Synod* he is reckoned up with *Arrius*, *Macedonius*, *Eutyches*, *Dioſcorus*, and the reſt of condemned *Hereticks*, among whom he is likewiſe reckoned by *Leo* 2. in his Epiſtle to *Conſtantine*. Which Evidence is ſo great, that *Canus* wonders at thoſe who would offer to vindicate him. And, in the mean time, you provide excellent moral means for the *Pope* to judge of matters of Faith by, in *General Councils*, if they may be guilty of ſo *groſs miſ-information*, as you ſuppoſe here in the caſe of *Honorius*; and not one barely, but three ſucceſſively, the *ſixth*, *ſeventh*, and *eighth*, and the whole *Church* from their time: till *Albertus Pighius*, who firſt began to defend him. For concluſion of this Point, *his Lordſhip would fain know (ſince this had been ſo plain, ſo eaſie a way, either to prevent all Diviſions about the Faith, or to end all Controverſies, did they ariſe) why this brief, but moſt neceſſary Propoſition, The Biſhop of* Rome *cannot err in his judicial Determinations concerning Faith, is not to be found either in Letter or Senſe, in any Scripture, in any Council, or in any Father of the Church, for the full ſpace of a Thouſand Years and more after Chriſt?* To this you anſwer, 1. *That in the Senſe wherein* Ibid.

Ambroſ. l. 10. ep. 83.

P. 264.

P. 280.

Action. 8. Synod. 6

Canus, l. 6. Cap. ult.

P. 267.

Catholicks maintain the Pope's Infallibility to be a matter of neceſſary Belief to all Chriſtians it is found (for Senſe) both in Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, as you ſay you have proved, in proving the Infallibility of General Councils, of which he is the moſt principal and neceſſary Member. So then, when we enquire for the *Infallibility* of *General Councils*, we are ſent to the *Pope* for his Confirmation to make them ſo; but when we enquire for the *Pope's Infallibility*, we are ſent back again to the *Councils*, for the Proof of it. And they are hugely to blame, if they give not an ample Teſtimony to the *Pope*, ſince he can do them as good a turn. But, between them both, we ſee the greateſt Reaſon to believe neither the one, nor the other to be Infallible. But, 2. You would offer at ſomething too for his *Perſonal Infallibility*; in which I highly commend your Prudence, that you ſay, *You will omit Scripture*; and you might as well have omitted all that follows, ſince you ſay only, *That the Teſtimonies you have produced, ſeem to do it in effect*; and at laſt ſay, *That it is an Aſſertion you have wholly declined the maintaining of, and judge it expedient to do ſo ſtill.* And you may very well do ſo, if there be no better Proofs for it than thoſe you have produced, but however, we

Ibid. muſt examine them. *Doth not the Council of* Chalcedon *ſeem to ſay, in effect, that the Pope is Infallible, when, upon the reading of his Epiſtle to them, in Condemnation of the Eutychian Hereſie, the whole Aſſembly of Prelates cry out with Acclamation, and profeſs that S.* Peter *(who was Infallible) ſpake by the Mouth of* Leo, *and that the Pope was Interpreter of the Apoſtle's Voice?* You do well to uſe thoſe cautious Expreſſions of *ſeeming to ſay in effect*, for it would be a very hard matter to imagine any ſuch thing as the *Pope's* Infallibility in the higheſt Expreſſions uſed by the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. For,

Concil. Chalc. part. 2. Act. 2. p. 228. after the reading of *Leo's Epiſtle* againſt *Eutyches*, and many Teſtimonies of the *Fathers* to the ſame Purpoſe, the *Council* begins their Acclamations, with theſe Words, *This is the Faith of the Fathers, this is the Faith of the Apoſtles; all who are orthodox hold thus.* And after it follows, *Peter by Leo hath thus ſpoken, the Apoſtles have taught thus.* Which are all the Words there extant to that purpoſe. And, Is not this a ſtout Argument, for the *Pope's Perſonal Infallibility*? For, What elſe do they mean, but only that *Leo*, who ſucceeded in the *Apoſtolical See* of S. *Peter* at *Rome*, did concur in Faith with S. *Peter*, and the reſt of the *Apoſtles*? But, Do they ſay, that it was impoſſible that *Leo* ſhould err, or that his Judgement was *Infallible*? or only that he owned that Doctrine which was *Divine* and *Apoſtolical*? And the *Council* of *Epheſus* (your next Teſtimony) hath much leſs than this, even nothing at all. For the *Council* ſpeaks not concerning S. *Peter*, or the *Pope*

Concil. Epheſ. p. 2. Act. 3. p. 330. in the place by you cited; only one of the *Pope's* officious *Legates*, *Philip*, begins very formally, with S. *Peter's being Prince and Head of the Apoſtles, &c. and that he to this Day* ἐν τοῖς ἀυτοῦ διαδόχοις ζῇ καὶ δικάζει; *lives in his Succeſſors, and paſſeth Judgment.* Is it not a very good Inference from hence, that the *Council* acknowledged the *Pope's Perſonal Infallibility*? Becauſe one of the *Pope's Legates* did aſſert in the *Council*, that S. *Peter lived and judged by the Pope.* And yet, Might not this be done without his Perſonal *Infallibility*, in regard of his Succeſſion in that *See* which was founded by S. *Peter*? But you are very hard driven, when you are fain to take up with the Sentence of a *Roman Prieſt*, inſtead of a *General Council*, and any *Judgment* in matters of Faith, inſtead of *Infallibility*. Your other Teſtimonies of S. *Hierom*, S. *Auguſtine*, and S. *Cyprian*, have been largely examined already; and

P. 281. for the remaining Teſtimonies of four *Popes*, you juſtly *fear it would be anſwered, that they were Popes, and ſpake partially in their own Cauſe.* And you give us no antidote againſt theſe Fears; but conclude very warily, *That you had*

had hitherto declined the defence of that Assertion, and professed that it would be sufficient for Protestants to acknowledge the Pope Infallible in, and with General Councils only. But, as we see no Reason to believe *General Councils* at all *Infallible*, whether with, or without the *Pope*; so neither can we see, but if the *Infallibility* of the *Council* depends on the *Pope's* Confirmation, you are bound to defend the *Pope's Personal Infallibility*, as the main *Bulwark* of your *Church*.

CHAP. III.

Of the Errors of Pretended General Councils.

The erroneous Doctrine of the Church of Rome *in making the Priests Intention necessary to the Essence of Sacraments. That Principle destructive to all Certainty of Faith upon our Author's Grounds. The Absurdity of asserting that Councils define themselves to be Infallible. Sacramental Actions sufficiently distinguished from others without the Priest's Intention. Of the moral Assurance of the Priest's Intention, and the Insufficiency of a meer virtual Intention. The Pope's Confirmation of Councils supposeth Personal Infallibility. Transubstantiation an Error decreed by Pope and Council. The Repugnancy of it to the Grounds of Faith. The Testimonies brought for it out of Antiquity examined at large, and shewed to be far from proving Transubstantiation. Communion in one kind a Violation of Christ's Institution. The Decree of the Council of* Constance *implies a* non obstante *to it. The unalterable Nature of Christ's Institution cleared. The several Evasions considered and answered. No publick Communion in one kind for a Thousand Years after Christ. The Indispensableness of Christ's Institution owned by the Primitive Church. Of Invocation of Saints, and the Rhetorical Expressions of the Fathers which gave occasion to it. No Footsteps of the Invocation of Saints in the three first Centuries; nor Precept or Example in Scripture as our Adversaries confess. Evidences against Invocation of Saints from the Christians Answers to the Heathens. The Worship of Spirits and Heroes among the Heathens justifiable on the same Grounds that Invocation of Saints is in the Church of* Rome. *Commemoration of the Saints without Invocation, in S.* Augustin's *time. Invocation of Saints as practised in the Church of* Rome, *a Derogation to the Merits of Christ. Of the Worship of Images, and the near approach to Pagan Idolatry therein No Use or Veneration of Images in the Primitive Church. The Church of* Rome *justly chargeable with the Abuses committed in the Worship of Images.*

ALthough nothing can be more unreasonable than to pretend that *Church*, *Person*, or *Council* to be *Infallible*, which we can prove to have actually erred; yet we have yielded so much to you, as to disprove what you have in general brought for the *one*, before we come to meddle with the *other*. But that being dispatched, we come to a more short and compendious way of overthrowing your *Infallibility*, by shewing the palpable Falsity of such Principles which must be owned by you as *Infallible* Truths, because defined by *General Councils* confirmed by the *Pope*. Whereof, *the first in the Endictment*, as you say, *is that of the Priest's Intention defined by the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent *(both of them confirmed by the Pope) to be essentially necessary to the Validity of a Sacrament.* Concerning this, there are two

Q. 1.

P. 281.

things to be enquired into, 1. *Whether this doth not render all Pretence of Infallibility with you a vain and uſeleſs thing?* 2. *Whether it be not in it ſelf an Error?*

We muſt begin with the *firſt* of theſe, for that was the Occaſion of his
P. 271. Lordſhip's entring upon it; for he was ſhewing, *That your claim of Infallibility is of no uſe at all, for the ſettling of Truth and Peace in the Church; becauſe no Man can either know or believe this Infallibility. It cannot be believed with Divine Faith; having no Foundation either in the written Word of God, or Tradition of the Catholick Church; and no humane Faith can be ſufficient in order to it. But neither can it be believed or known, upon that Decree of the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent, *that the Intention of the Prieſt is neceſſary to the Validity of a Sacrament.* And leſt you ſhould think I repreſent his Lordſhip's Words too much with Advantage, I will take his Argument in the Words you have ſummed it up in, which are theſe: *Before the Church or any particular Man can make uſe of the Pope's Infallibility (that is, be ſettled, and confirmed in the Truth by means thereof) he muſt either know, or upon ſure Grounds believe, that he is Infallible. But (*ſays the Biſhop*) this can only be believed of him, as he is S.* Peter's *Succeſſor and Biſhop of* Rome; *of which it is impoſſible, in the Relator's Opinion, for the Church or any particular Man, to have ſuch Certainty, as is ſufficient to ground an Infallible Belief. Why? Becauſe the Knowledge and Belief of this, depends upon his being truly in Orders, truly a Biſhop, truly a Prieſt, truly Baptized; none of all which, according to our Principles, can be certainly known and believed; becauſe (forſooth) the Intention of him that adminiſtred theſe Sacraments to the Pope, or made him Biſhop, Prieſt,* &c. *can never be certainly known; and yet by the Doctrine of the Councils of* Florence *and* Trent, *it is of abſolute neceſſity to the Validity of every one of theſe Sacraments, ſo as without it, the Pope were neither Biſhop nor Prieſt.* Thus I grant you have faithfully ſumm'd up his Lordſhip's Argument; we muſt now ſee with what Courage and Succeſs you encounter it. Your firſt Anſwer is, *That though it be level'd againſt the Pope's Infallibility, yet it hath the ſame Force againſt the Infallibility of the whole Church in Points Fundamental; for we cannot be Infallibly ſure, there is ſuch a Number of Baptized Perſons to make a Church.* By this, we ſee how likely you are to aſſoil this Difficulty, who bring it more ſtrongly upon your ſelf, without the leaſt Inconvenience to your Adverſary. For I grant, it neceſſarily follows againſt the Pretence of any *Infallibility*, whether in *Church*, *Councils*, or *Pope*, as being a *certain ground* for *Faith*; for all theſe muſt ſuppoſe ſuch a *Certainty* of the due *Adminiſtration* of *Sacraments*, which your Doctrine of *Intention* doth utterly deſtroy. For theſe two things are your *Principles* of *Faith*, that there can be no certainty of *Faith*, without preſent *Infallibility* of the *Church*; and that, in order to the believing this *Teſtimony Infallible*, there muſt be ſuch a *certainty* as is ground ſufficient for an *Infallible Belief*. Now, How is it poſſible there can be ſuch, when there can be no *certainty* of the *Being* of a *Church*, *Council*, or *Pope*, from your own Principles? For when the only way of knowing this, is a thing not poſſible to be evidenced to any one in any way of *Infallibile certainty*, viz. *the Intention of the Prieſt*, you muſt unavoidably deſtroy all your Pretence of *Infallibility*. For, To what purpoſe do you tell me, that *Pope* or *Councils* are *Infallible*, unleſs I may be *Infallibly ſure* that ſuch *Decrees* were paſſed by *Pope* and *Council*? I cannot be aſſured of that, unleſs I be firſt aſſured that they were *Baptized Perſons*, and *Biſhops* of the *Church*; and for this you dare not offer at *Infallible certainty*, and therefore all the reſt is uſeleſs and vain. So that while by this Doctrine of *the Intention of the Prieſt for the Validity of the Sacraments*, you thought to advance higher the Reputation of the *Prieſthood*, and to take away the *Aſſurance* of

Proteſtants,

Proteſtants, as to the Benefits which come by the uſe of the *Sacraments* of *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, you could not have aſſured any thing more really pernicious to your ſelves, than this *Doctrine* is. So ſtrange an *Incogitancy* was it in thoſe Councils to define it, and as great in thoſe who defend it, and yet at the ſame time, maintain the Neceſſity of a preſent *Infallibility* in the *Church* and *general Councils*. For can any thing be more *rational*, than to deſire the higheſt *Aſſurance* as to that, whoſe *Decrees* I am to believe *Infallible*? And yet at the laſt, you confeſs we can have but a *moral Certainty* of it, and that of the loweſt degree; the utmoſt ground of it, being either the Teſtimony of the *Prieſt* himſelf, or, that *we have no ground to ſuſpect the contrary*. Now what unreaſonable Men are you, who ſo much to the Diſhonour of *Chriſtian Religion* cry out upon the *rational Evidence* of the *Truth* of it, as an *uncertain Principle*, and that *Proteſtants* though they aſſert the higheſt Degree of actual *Certainty*, cannot have any *Divine Faith*, becauſe they want the *Churches infallible Teſtimony*? And yet when we enquire into this *Infallible Teſtimony*, you are fain to reſolve it, into one of the moſt *uncertain* and *conjectural* things imaginable. For what can I have leſs ground to build my Faith upon, than that the *Prieſt* had at leaſt a *virtual Intention* to do as the *Church* doth? Whom muſt I believe in this Caſe? And whereon muſt that *Faith* be grounded? On the *Prieſts Teſtimony*? But how can I be aſſured, but that he, who may wander in his *Intention*, may do ſo in his *Expreſſion* too? Or muſt I do it becauſe I have no *reaſon* to *ſuſpect* the contrary? how can you aſſure me of that, that I have no reaſon to ſuſpect the contrary? no otherwiſe than by telling me, that the *Prieſt* is a Man of that *Honeſty* and *Integrity*, that he cannot be ſuppoſed to do ſuch a thing without *Intention*? So that, though I were in *Italy* or *Spain*, where, ſome have told us, it is no hard Matter to meet with *Jews* in *Prieſts Habits*, and profeſſing themſelves ſuch, and acting accordingly; yet I am bound to believe (though) they heartily believe nothing of *Chriſtianity*) that in all *Sacraments* they muſt have an *Intention* to do as the *Church* doth. Without which, we are told by you, *No Sacrament can be valid, becauſe the Matter and Form cannot be determined or united without the Prieſt's Intention*. And therefore I do not only Object, that this takes away the *Comfort* of all *Sacraments* as to the *Receivers*, but that it deſtroys all certain *Foundations of Faith*. Becauſe the Promiſes of *Infallibility* ſuppoſing that, which I can have no *aſſurance* of, that *Infallibility* can be no Foundation of *Faith* at all to me. As for Inſtance, Suppoſe the *Title* to an *Eſtate* depends upon the *King's free Donation*, and this *Donation* to be confirmed by his *great Seal*; but yet ſo, that if the *Lord Chancellor* in the *ſealing* it, doth not *intend* it ſhould paſs on that Account, the whole *Gift* becomes null in *Law*. I pray tell me now, What other *Aſſurance* you can have of your *Title* to this Eſtate, than you have of the *Lord Chancellor's Intention* in paſſing the *Seal*? And what *Infallible Certainty* you can have of ſuch *Intention* of his? Juſt ſuch is your Caſe, you tell us, The only Ground of *Infallible Certainty* in Faith is the *Churches Infallibility*, this *Infallibility* comes by a *free Promiſe of Chriſt*, this *Promiſe* muſt ſuppoſe a *Church* in being; that there is a *Church*, we can have no more *Aſſurance* than that there are *Baptized Perſons*, but the Validity of their *Baptiſm* requires the *Prieſt's Intention* in adminiſtring it; and therefore we can have no more *Aſſurance* of the *Churches Infallibility*, than we have of the Prieſt's *Intention*. And, is this it at laſt, which your loud Clamours of *Infallibility* come to? Is this the Effect of all your *Exclamations* againſt *Proteſtants*, for making Faith *uncertain* by taking away the *Church's Infallibility*? Muſt our Faith at laſt be reſolved into that, which it is impoſſible

poſſible we ſhould have any undoubted *Aſſurance* at all of? And will not the higheſt Reaſon, the cleareſt Evidence, the moſt pregnant Demonſtrations which things are capable of, be accounted with you *ſufficient Ground* to build our *Faith* of the *Scriptures* upon? And yet, muſt a thing ſo *impoſſible* to be *certainly* known, ſo generally uncertain and conjectural, be accounted by you ſufficient Ground to believe your *Churches Infallibility*? Are not the *Miracles* wrought by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, joyned with the *Univerſal Tradition* of the Chriſtian Church, a ground firm enough, for us to believe the *Doctrine* of Chriſt divine? And yet muſt the *Intention* of the *Prieſt* with you be a much ſurer Ground than theſe are? By all which it appears, that if I had not already largely diſcovered your grand *Impoſture* in your Pretence to *Infallibility*, this very Doctrine would invincibly prove it; ſince, notwithſtanding that Pretence, you muſt reſolve all into ſomething which falls ſhort of thoſe Grounds of *Certainty* which we have to build our *Faith* upon. But we muſt now conſider, how you offer to retort this upon his Lordſhip; for you ſay, *The ſame Argument will hold againſt the Infallibility of the whole Church in Fundamentals; ſince Men cannot be Infallibly ſure, there is ſuch a Company of Men who are truly Baptized.* But how manifeſtly ridiculous this is, will appear, 1. That it will hold indeed againſt all ſuch who aſſert this Doctrine of the *neceſſity* of the *Prieſt's Intention*, but not others. Therefore if his Lordſhip had ſaid, This Doctrine had been true, the Retortion had been good; but you ſaw well enough he diſproves it as an *Error*, and urges this as an Abſurdity conſequent upon it. Your Argument then as it is, runs in this Form: If they who hold the *Prieſts* Intention neceſſary cannot be *ſure* who are Baptized, then they who do not hold it neceſſary, cannot. Where is your Conſequence? For he was ſhewing, the *uncertainty* of it depended upon that Principle, and therefore I ſuppoſe the denying of the Principle doth not ſtand guilty of the ſame Abſurdity, which the holding it doth. But it may be, the Force lies in being *Infallibly ſure*, and ſo that none can know the Infallibility of the Church in *Fundamentals*, but ſuch as are *Infallibly ſure* that Men are Baptized. I Anſwer therefore, 2. That there is no ſuch neceſſity of being *Infallibly ſure*, upon our Principles as there is upon yours. For you build your *Faith* upon the *Churches Infallibility* in *Pope* and *Councils*, but we do not pretend to build our Faith upon the *Church's Infallibility* in *Fundamentals*. All that we aſſert, is, that the *Church* is Infallible in *Fundamentals*; but we do not ſay, the ground of our *Faith* is, becauſe ſhe is ſo, for that were to make the *Church* the *formal Object* of our *Faith*: Since therefore we do not rely on the *Church* as our *Infallible Guide* in *Fundamentals*, there is no ſuch Neceſſity of that *Infallible Certainty* as to this Principle as there is with you, who muſt wholly eſtabliſh your Faith upon the *Churches* Infallibility. The moſt then that we aſſert, is, that there is and ſhall always be a *Church*, for that (as I have told you) is all that is meant by a *Church* being *Infallible* in *Fundamentals*; now for this we have the greateſt Aſſurance poſſible, that there *ſhall be* from the Promiſes of Chriſt, and that *there is*, from the Certainty we have of the Faith and Baptiſm of *Chriſtians*, ſince no more is required by us to aſſure Men of it, than all Men in the World are competent *Judges* of; which ſurely they cannot be of the *Prieſt's* Intention. So much for your weak Attempt of retorting this Argument upon his Lordſhip.

C. 2. Ibid. But the main thing to be conſidered, is, your ſolid Anſwer you give to it; which indeed is of that weight, that it muſt not be ſlightly paſſed over. You Anſwer therefore, *That both a General Council and the Pope, when they define any Matters of Faith, do alſo implicitly define that themſelves are*

are Infallible; and by Conſequence that both the Pope in ſuch Caſe, and alſo the Biſhops that ſit in Council are Perſons Baptized, in holy Orders, and have all things eſſentially neceſſary for that Function, which they then execute. Neither is there any more Difficulty in the Caſe of the Pope now, than there was in the time of the Prophets and Apoſtles of old; whom all muſt grant that with the ſame Breath they defined, or Infallibly declared the ſeveral Articles and Points of Doctrine propoſed by them to the Faithful, and their own Infallibility in propoſing them. So indeed *Vega* anſwered in the Caſe of *general Councils*; for when it was demanded, How it ſhould be known that the *Council* was a lawful *Council*, he ſays, *Becauſe the Councel defined it ſelf to be ſo*; but for this he is ſufficiently chaſtiſed by *Bellarmine*, who gives this unanſwerable Argument againſt it. Either it doth appear from ſome other Argument, that while the *Council* defines it ſelf to be a lawful *Council*, it was a lawful *Council*; or it doth not: if it doth, To what Purpoſe doth it define it ſelf to be a lawful *Council?* If it doth not, then we ſhall doubt of that Decree whereby it defines it ſelf to be ſo: For if I doubt, whether the *Council* were lawful before that Decree; I doubt likewiſe, whether it might not err in paſſing that Decree. And therefore he grants, that no more than *moral Certainty* or hiſtorical Faith is requiſite in order to it. Now this Argument of *Bellarmine*'s holds with equal Strength (if not more) againſt you; for you derive the Lawfulneſs of the *Council* from its *Infallibility*, and that *Infallibility* from the *Council's* Definition. Thus therefore I argue: Either it doth not appear, that the *Council* was *Infallible* before that Definition, or doth it not. If it appears to be *Infallible* before, then its *Infallibility* is not known by that Definition: If it doth not, How can I know it to be *Infallible* by it? For as I doubt, whether it was *Infallible* before it, ſo I muſt doubt, whether it was Infallible in it: and conſequently it is impoſſible I ſhould believe it Infallible becauſe it defines it ſelf to be ſo. Neither do you at all ſalve this, by calling it only an *implicite Definition*, for whether it be *implicite* or *explicite*, it is all one, ſince that *Definition* is made the Ground, why we muſt believe the *Council* to be Infallible. And of all Men in the World you ſeem the ſtrangeſt in this, that you declaim with ſo much vehemency againſt thoſe who believe the *Scriptures* to be *Infallible for themſelves*; and yet aſſert that *Pope* and *General Councils* are to be believed *Infallible*, *becauſe they define themſelves to be ſo.* Than which no greater Abſurdity can be well imagined. For they who aſſert that the *Scriptures* are to be believed for *themſelves*, do not thereby mean that they are to be believed *Infallible* meerly becauſe they ſay they are *Infallible*, but that out of the *Scriptures* ſuch *Arguments* may be brought, as may ſufficiently prove that they come from *God.* But when you ſay, that *Pope and general Councils* are to be believed *Infallible*, becauſe of their *implicite Definition* that they are ſo, you can mean nothing elſe, but that they are *Infallible*, becauſe they take upon them to be *Infallible*, for that is all I can underſtand by your *implicit Definition*; for if they ſhould decree they were Infallible, that were an *explicit Definition.* But yet how ſhould this *implicit Definition* be known? For it muſt be ſome way certainly known, or elſe we can never believe that they are Infallible upon that Account. Which way then muſt we underſtand that they *implicitly* define it? Is it by their Meeting, debating, decreeing Matters of *Faith*? That cannot be, for *Councils* have done all theſe which are acknowledged to have *erred.* Is it by *Pope* and *Council* joyning together? But how can that be, unleſs I know before, that, when *Pope* and *Council* joyn, they are *Infallible*? If this then be all the way to prove that *Pope* and *Council* are *true Biſhops*

De Concil. l. 2. c. 9.

becauſe

becauſe *Infallible*, and they are *Infallible* becauſe they define themſelves to be ſo; I ſee, there is an abſolute Neceſſity of a man's putting out the *Eye* of his Reaſon, if ever he hopes to *ſee Pope* and *Councils Infallible*: But further yet, there is more Abſurdity ſtill (if more can be imagin'd) in this excellent Anſwer; for here is a new *Labyrinth* for our Author to ſport himſelf in. For, we are to believe a *Council* to conſiſt of lawful *Biſhops* becauſe they are *Infallible*, and yet his only way to prove them *Infallible*, is by ſuppoſing that they conſiſt of lawful *Biſhops*. For I ask, Whether all Perſons meeting together in *Council* are Infallible? *No*, Are all *Biſhops* of *Proteſtant*, and the *Greek*, and other *Churches* beſides the *Roman*, aſſembled in *Council* Infallible? *No.* Muſt it not then be ſuppoſed, that the *Biſhops* are lawful *Biſhops*, before they can *implicitly* define themſelves Infallible? And if their Lawfulneſs muſt be ſuppoſed before their Infallibility, they cannot firſt be proved to be Infallible, before we can know, Whether they were lawful *Biſhops* or no. And we cannot know them to be lawful *Biſhops*, unleſs we knew the *Intention* of the *Prieſt*; and therefore it remains proved with Evidence equal to a *Demonſtration*, that your *Certainty* of your *Churches* Infallibility, can be no greater than that you have of the *Prieſt's* Intention in the Adminiſtration of *Sacraments*.

And by this it appears, how abſurdly you go about *to compare the Caſe of Pope and Council, with that of the Prophets and Apoſtles of old.* For you challenge not an *Infallibility* by *immediate Inſpiration*, but ſuch as is conſtantly reſident in the *Church*, by vertue of ſome particular *Promiſes*, which muſt ſuppoſe the *Perſons* in whom it lodges to be actually *Members* of the *Church*. And therefore all the proof of their *Infallibility* depends upon the *Certainty* of that, which you can never ſatisfie any rational men in; but, I hope, you will not ſay, it was ſo in the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*. Beſides, *God* never ſent any Perſons with a Meſſage from himſelf to the World, but he gave the World ſufficient Evidence in point of Reaſon that He ſent them; either by *Miracles*, the *Teſtimony* of other *Prophets* who wrought them, or ſome other ſatisfactory way to humane Reaſon, as I have elſewhere proved at large. But there is no ſuch thing in your Caſe, no rational Evidence at all is offered, but we muſt believe the *Council* lawful becauſe *Infallible*, and we muſt believe it *Infallible* becauſe it defines it ſelf to be ſo. Neither is it poſſible to conceive that any man ſhould believe whatever the *Prophet* or *Apoſtle* ſaid, to be *Infallibly true*; unleſs he were before convinced, that they were *Infallible* who ſpake it. But for this you have a further Anſwer, *That it is not neceſſary to believe the Infallibility of the Propoſer*, viz. prioritate temporis, *in reſpect of time, and afterwards the Infallibility of the Doctrine he propoſeth: but it ſufficeth to believe it firſt* prioritate naturæ, *ſo as the Infallibility of the Teacher be preſuppoſed to the Infallibility of his Doctrine.* But what this makes to your Purpoſe, I underſtand not. For it is not the *Time*, but the Evidence we enquire for, or the *Ground* on which we are to believe the Propoſer *Infallible*. Whether it muſt not be ſomething elſe beſides the *implicit defining* himſelf to be *Infallible*? You aſſert that to be a ſufficient Ground in the Caſe of *Pope* and *Councils*; and I pray, Will it not be as ſufficient in the Caſe of a *Quaker*, or *Enthuſiaſt*? May not they as well pretend this, that they are *Infallible*? And if you ask them what Evidence they have for it, they may tell you, juſt the ſame that *Pope* and *Council* have to be ſo: For, as they *implicitly define themſelves to be Infallible, ſo do they.* So that, talk what you will of *private Spirits* and *Enthuſiaſms*, I know none lay ſo great a Foundation for them as you do upon this Pretence; *That we are to believe the Pope and Council Infallible, becauſe implicitly they define themſelves to be ſo.* Than which, one could hardly meet with a more,

a more abſurd Anſwer from the higheſt *Enthuſiaſt*: For he can tell you as boldly, that he hath the *Spirit* of *God*, becauſe he hath it; and juſt ſo much you ſay, and no more, *Pope and Council are Infallible, becauſe they are Infallible.* But I muſt pity you: I know you would not willingly have run into theſe *Abſurdities*, but it was your hard Fortune to maintain a bad Cauſe, and you could not poſſibly help it; for the *Straights* you were in, were ſo great, that you muſt venture thorow ſome great *Abſurdity* to get out of them. But all the Pity I have for you is gone, when I read your next Words. *Thus we conceive the Relator's* Achilles *is fallen.* How fallen? If he be, it is only with *Antæus*, to riſe the ſtronger. But I aſſure you, ſo far was he from falling by any force of your Anſwer, that he ſtands more impregnably than ever, having not ſo much as a *Heel* left, that you can wound him in. And if you have nothing more to ſay, than what you here give us in anſwer to this Argument, which you tell us, *is the common Anſwer of Divines*; I am ſo far from wondring that his Lordſhip took no notice of it, that I ſhall only wonder at the Weakneſs of your Judgment, or largeneſs of your Faith, that can ſo contentedly ſwallow ſuch grand *Abſurdities.*

If this be but, as you ſay, *the Prologue to the Play*, I doubt you will find but a ſad *Cataſtrophe* in it: *The main Buſineſs*, you tell us, *is about the Prieſt's intention, concerning which he poſitively lays down, that it is not of abſolute Neceſſity to the Eſſence of a Sacrament, ſo as to make it void, though the Prieſt's Thoughts ſhould wander from his work, at the Inſtant of uſing the Eſſentials of a Sacrament; yea, or have in him an actual Intention to ſcorn the Church.* What now have you to ſhew to the contrary? *If the Prieſt's Intention be not abſolutely neceſſary to the eſſence or validity of a Sacrament, you deſire a Reaſon of your Adverſaries, Why we ſhould not think a Prieſt conſecrates the body of Chriſt, as much at a Table where there is Wheaten Bread before him, and that either by way of diſputation, or reading the 26 Chapter of S.* Matthew, *he pronounces the Words*, Hoc eſt corpus meum, *as he doth at the Altar; ſince here is the true form*, Hoc eſt corpus meum, *the true matter Wheaten Bread, and he that pronounces the form, is a true Prieſt, and yet in all Mens Judgment here's no true Sacrament made. Something elſe therefore is requiſite to the Eſſence of a Sacrament, and, What can that poſſibly be, if it be not the Intention which the Church requires?* Since your Requeſt is reaſonable, I ſhall endeavour your Satisfaction, and the rather becauſe it tends to the full clearing the Buſineſs in hand. To your Enquiry then, I anſwer, That the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* requiring ſuch a *Solemnity* for the Adminiſtration of it, and ſuch a *Diſpoſition* in the *Church* for the receiving it, and the Performance of ſuch *Acts*, in order to the Adminiſtration, by the *Diſpenſer* of it; theſe do ſufficiently diſtinguiſh the *Lord's Supper* from all other Actions, what Matter, Form, or Perſon ſoever be there. Were not in the *Apoſtles* times the aſſembling of the People together for this end, and the ſolemn Performance of the *Acts* of *Adminiſtration*, ſufficient to diſcriminate the *Lord's Supper*, from reading the 26 of *Matthew*, by an *Apoſtle* at the Table, when there was *Bread* and *Wine* upon it? And I muſt confeſs, I cannot but wonder that you ſhould be ſo much to ſeek as not to know the one from the other, unleſs you knew the *Prieſt's Intention*? But I conſider, your Queſtion was not made for *Apoſtolical times*, but for *private Maſſes*, wherein the *Prieſt* may mumble over the Words of *Conſecration* to himſelf, and none elſe be the wiſer or better for what he ſaith, or doth. Here it was indeed very requiſite you ſhould make the *Prieſt's Intention* neceſſary to *diſcriminate* this Action, from that you mentioned; but, where-ever the *Lord's Supper* is duly adminiſtred according to the *Primitive Inſtitution*, the Solemnity of the Action and Circumſtances

P. 283.

do ſo far individuate it, as ſufficiently to difference it from any other *Formalities* whatſoever. And ſo it is in *conferring Orders*; Is there not enough, do you think, in the *Solemnity* of the Action, with the preceding *Circumſtances*, and the *Biſhops* laying on of his *Hands*, with the uſing the Words proper to that Occaſion, to difference it from the *Biſhops* caſual laying his Hands on the Head of a man, and in the mean time reading perchance the *Words* of *Ordination*? We aſſert then, that no further *Intention* is at all *neceſſary* to the Eſſence of a *Sacrament*, but what is diſcoverable by the outward Action. Which being of that Nature, which may difference it ſelf by reaſon of peculiar *Circumſtances* from others, there is no imaginable Neceſſity to have recourſe to the private *Intention* of the *Prieſt* for Satisfaction. But ſee how unreaſonable you are herein; for you would make that to be neceſſary to diſtinguiſh a *Sacramental Action* from any other, which it is impoſſible any man ſhould be acquainted with. For, if I had no other way to diſtinguiſh in the Caſe you mention, but the *Prieſt's Intention*, I muſt be as much to ſeek as ever, unleſs I certainly knew what the *Prieſt's* Intention was; which if you have an Art of being acquainted with, I pretend not to it. Is it then neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the one from the other, or not? If not, To what end is your Queſtion? If it be, To what Purpoſe is the Prieſt's Intention, when I cannot know it? But you would ſeem to object againſt the *Circumſtances* diſcriminating a *Sacramental Action*. 1. *If the Circumſtances do ſhew to the Standers by, that the Prieſt really intends to make a Sacrament, and this Signification be neceſſary; Then the Prieſt's Intention is neceſſary, or elſe, Why is it neceſſary it ſhould be ſignified?* I anſwer, The Circumſtances are not intended to ſignifie the *Prieſt's Intention* any further, than that *Intention* is diſcoverable by the *Actions* themſelves, ſo that it is not any *inward Intention* which is thereby ſignified, but only ſuch an *Intention* as the *outward Action* imports, which is the Celebration of the *bleſſed Sacrament*. So it is not the *Prieſt's* intending *to make a Sacrament*, as you phraſifie it, but his intending *to celebrate it*, *i. e.* not ſuch an *Intention* as is *unitive* of *matter* and *form*, as your *Schools* ſpeak in this Caſe, but ſuch as relates to the *external Action*. But againſt this you urge, 2. *That ſuch external Signification is not at all neceſſary; for*, ſay you, *Might not a Catholick Prieſt, to ſave the Soul of ſome dying Infant, baptize it, if he could, without any ſuch Signification by Circumſtances?* Yes, and a very charitable Man he would be in it too, if without any *Signification* by *Circumſtances*, *he could ſave the Soul of a dying Infant*. But I ſhould think his meer Intention were ſufficient, and that the *chief Prieſt* would ſupply the reſt, as the *Schools* determine in a like Caſe. For they put a very hard Queſtion to themſelves, *If the Intention of a Prieſt be neceſſary to the Validity of a Sacrament, then, What becomes of the Soul of an Infant, which dies, being baptized without the Prieſt's Intention?* To which they anſwer, *It may be very piouſly believed, that in that Caſe*, ſummus Sacerdos ſupplebit, *the High Prieſt will ſupply that Defect*; and what they ſay of *Intention*, is much more true of *Baptiſm* it ſelf; for in Caſe it be not done out of *Contempt*, I ſay that *ſummus Sacerdos ſupplebit*: It is not the meer want of *Baptiſm* will damn the Soul of the *Infant*, (as you ſuppoſe) when you make it ſo neceſſary, to uſe ſuch *Shifts* as you ſpeak of, *to ſave the Soul of a dying Infant*. But, Do you thing ſeriouſly, that is the way to do it; for *a Prieſt, under a Phyſical Pretence to ſprinkle Water on the Child's Face often, and once among the reſt, to ſay ſoftly, or by way of Diſcourſe*, Ego te baptizo, &c. *with Intention to conferr the Sacrament*? But you ask however, *Whether the Child be not really baptized by this, although none took notice of what the Prieſt did?* I anſwer, though we ſhould grant it, yet it proves not that the *Prieſt's*

Alexand. Alenſis part 4. quæſt. 8. memb. 3. art. 1. ſect. 1. Reo ſine præjudicio, &c. Bonaventur. c. 4. diſt. 6. art. 2. quæſt. 1. ad. fin.

Priests inward Intention was it which made it a *Sacrament*; but the Observation of the *Institution* of Christ in the external Actions; and so far, as that is observed in this *odd kind* of *baptizing*, so far it is *Baptism*, and no more. There are two Things therefore to be observed in *Sacramental Actions*. 1. The *differencing* of them from other *common* or *ordinary Actions*, and this we say is done by the *Circumstances* attending them. 2. The *Validity* of them as *Sacraments*, and this depends wholly and only on the Observation of *Christ's Institution*. For, as it is *Institution* which makes a *Sacrament*, so it is the Observation of it, which makes this a *Sacramental Action*, and not another. But in neither case is the *Priest's Intention* necessary to the Essence of a *Sacrament*; for it may have its full Force in all Respects it was appointed for, whatever the *Priests* inward Intention be. So that neither of your Instances, as to the *Sacraments* of *Baptism*, or the *Eucharist*, do at all imply the Necessity of the *Priest's Intention*, in order to the Essence of a *Sacrament*, in either of them.

§. 4. P. 284.

As for the Inconvenience which, you say, *the Bishop pretends would follow out of this Doctrine*, viz. *that no Man can rest secure that he hath been really made Partaker of any Sacrament, no not of Baptism it self.* You answer, 1. *That as to the far greater part of Christians, the Inconvenience follows as much out of the Bishop's Principles as yours, that they cannot be absolutely certain that they are baptized? because the Priest may vitiate something pertaining to the Essentials of Baptism.* 2. You answer, *That moral Assurance is sufficient in such Cases*, i. e. *such as is liable to no just cause of doubting and suspecting the contrary.* We accept of this latter Answer in reference to your Retortion of the *Inconvenience* upon us, as to which we say, That where is no sufficient cause of doubting, a Man ought to rest satisfied. But I shall now shew you, that this *moral assurance* cannot be sufficient in your Case, and that for these Reasons, 1. Because you build a main Principle of *Faith* upon it, and you say, *That moral Assurance cannot be a sufficient Foundation for Faith*; for then all your Discourse of the *Resolution of Faith*, comes to nothing, which runs upon this Principle, *That nothing short of Infallibility can be a sufficient Foundation for Faith.* Now that you build a Principle of *Faith* upon it, is evident, as I have proved already, even all that *Infallibility* you pretend to in *Church*, *Pope*, and *Council*; for all depends upon this, that you certainly know, that such Persons in your *Church* have had the *Sacrament* of *Baptism* truly administred, which cannot be without knowing the *Priest's Intention*. 2. Because you acknowledged before, that there must be such a *certainty* as is sufficient to ground an *Infallible Belief*; for this you placed in his Lordship's Objection, and this you pretended to satisfie, by saying, *That the Pope and Council implicitly define themselves to be Infallible*; and therefore you fall much beneath your self now, when you say, *Moral Assurance* is sufficient. 3. Because we have far greater ground for *moral Assurance* than you: for we make no more requisite to the *Essence* of a *Sacrament*, than what all Men are competent *Judges* of; and our *Church* allows no such *Baptisms*, wherein none but the *Priest* is present; therefore if he *vitiates* any thing *essential* to *Baptism*, it may easily be discovered; but in your case you have no positive *Assurance* at all of the *Priest's Intention*, the utmost you can pretend to, is, your having no *ground* to suspect it, which in many cases there may be. So that you cannot have properly a *moral Certainty*, which hath some Evidence to build it self upon; but in your case there can be no *Evidence* at all of the *Priest's Intention*, and therefore the Knowledge of it is uncertain and conjectural. So that there is a vast difference between that *moral Assurance*, which we may have from the *external Action*, and that which you can possibly have

from the *Prieſt's Intention.* 4. The Danger is far greater, in not having this *Aſſurance* upon your Principles, than upon ours, and yet we have far greater *Aſſurance* than you can poſſible pretend to. Your Danger is manifeſtly greater, as appears by this evident Demonſtration of it, *viz* that in Caſe the *Prieſt's Intention* be wanting, you muſt, by your own Confeſſion, be guilty of *groſs Idolatry*; and yet you cannot certainly know, what the *Prieſt's* Intention was. This is plain in the Caſe of the *Euchariſt*, whoſe *Adoration* you profeſs to be *lawful*, becauſe you ſuppoſe *Chriſt* to be preſent there. Now this depends upon a thing impoſſible for you certainly to know, and that is the *Prieſt's* Intention *in the* Conſecration. For if the *Prieſt* wanted that *inward* Intention which you make neceſſary to the Eſſence of a *Sacrament*, then, for all his pronouncing the Words of *Conſecration*, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, *Chriſt's Body* may not be there; and in caſe it be not there, you are by your own Confeſſion guilty of *Idolatry*, for you do not then worſhip *Chriſt*, but meerly the *Bread*. Therefore, ſuppoſing *Adoration* of the *Euchariſt* upon your Principle of *Tranſubſtantiation* were not *Idolatry*, yet ſince that depends upon a thing *impoſſible* to be *known*. Who can with a good Conſcience do that, which he cannot be certain, but in the doing it, he may commit the *greateſt Idolatry*? Wherefore, all the ill Conſequences of this Doctrine of the *Intention* of the *Prieſt* conſidered, beſides the palpable Errors of it, never was any Doctrine more imprudently contrived, or more weakly managed, than when this was decreed at the *Councils* of *Florence* and *Trent*.

§. 5. P. 284, &c. You ſpend many Words to explain that *virtual Intention* which the *Schools* have taken up from *Scotus* upon this Subject; but, all that you ſay, adds nothing of Satisfaction: Upon theſe Grounds, 1. Becauſe this *virtual Intention* muſt ſuppoſe ſome *actual* Intention, ſo it is in all thoſe Caſes you mention *of a Servant on his Journey*, *a Labourer at his Work*; tho' theſe may not have always an *expreſs Intention* of the Deſign of their Journey or Labour, yet there is ſufficient Evidence from both of them, to know they had an *actual Intention*, and there is no neceſſity of knowing any more of it, than what their *Actions* diſcover: but in your Caſe it is neceſſary to know that there was once an *actual Intention*, becauſe upon that depends the *Eſſence* of the *Sacrament*: And that is it which we object againſt you, that you cannot have any Aſſurance that the Prieſt ever had an *expreſs Intention*. We do not therefore ſay, that any wandring Thoughts after, do deſtroy the *eſſence* of a *Sacrament*; but the want of an *actual Intention* at all upon your Principles doth it, and this you cannot be certain of upon your Grounds. And therefore your *virtual Intention* doth you no ſervice at all; for you ſay, *This virtual Intention is, when the Prieſt doth really operate, or celebrate the Sacrament in virtue of an expreſs Intention which he had to do it*; therefore it neceſſarily follows, that the *Eſſence* and *Validity* of the *Sacrament* muſt depend upon the firſt *expreſs Intention*, and not the after virtual one. So that if you cannot be certain of the *firſt actual Intention*, the *Sacrament* may want its Eſſence, for all that you know. 2. Though a *virtual Intention* may be conſiſtent with ſome *wandring Thoughts* from the *firſt Intention*, yet not with an *expreſs Intention* to the *contrary*. As in your own Inſtance, A Servant ſent upon Buſineſs, hath at firſt an *expreſs Intention*, to do what his Maſter commands him; after, falling into Company upon his Way, he loſeth for the time his *actual Intention*; but, as long as he goes on upon his firſt Buſineſs, he retains, I grant, a *virtual Intention* of it: But, ſuppoſing that Company diſſwade him from it, or his own Mind turn, ſo that he hath an *actual Intention* to the contrary, Will you ſay, this man retains his *virtual Intention* ſtill?

ſtill? Now our Argument doth not lie meerly in this, that the *Prieſt*, at the inſtant of *Conſecration*, may have his Mind diſtracted from the matter, in which caſe you ſay, *The virtual Intention* remains ſtill, and is ſufficient; but, that you cannot have any *Certainty*, but he may have an *actual* and *expreſs Intention* to the *contrary*, at the inſtant of *Conſecration*, and this deſtroys his *virtual Intention*, and conſequently the Eſſence of the *Sacrament*. For, as long as you require an *inward Intention*, beſides the *external Action*, you muſt be aſſured, that he had no actual contrary *Intention* at that time, or elſe your *virtual Intention* ſignifies nothing to your Purpoſe or Satisfaction. That which remains, is concerning *Catharinus*, of whom his Lordſhip ſays, *That being preſent at* Trent, *he diſputed this caſe very learnedly, and made it moſt evident, that this Opinion cannot be defended, but that it muſt open a way for any unworthy Prieſt, to make infinite Nullities in the Adminiſtration of Sacraments; and that his Arguments were of ſuch Strengh, as amazed the other Divines which were preſent. And concluded, that no internal Intention was required in the Miniſter of a Sacrament, but that Intention which did appear,* opere externo, *in the work it ſelf performed by him; and that if he had unworthily any wandring Thoughts; nay more, any contrary Intention within him, yet it neither did, nor could hinder the bleſſed effect of any Sacrament.* P. 273. To this you anſwer, *That the Cardinal* Palavicino *is clear of Opinion, that the Council decreed nothing againſt him; becauſe he denied not an Intention to be neceſſary in the Sacrament, but only explicated the thing differently from the common way of the Schoolmen.* P. 285. But whoſoever will read the Arguments which *Catharinus* uſed in the *Council* of *Trent* againſt the *Prieſt's Intention*, will eaſily find that he diſputes againſt all manner of *inward Intention*, but ſuch as may be diſcovered by the external Action. But we muſt conſider that *Palavicino* had a particular Kindneſs for *Catharinus*, as being of *Siena* (the preſent *Pope's* Country) inſomuch that *Cæſar Aquilinius* ſaith, *If* Luther *had been of* Siena, *the Cardinal* Palavicino *would have defended him:* and thence he endeavours to vindicate him in the Point of Certitude of *Grace*, as well as in this of the *Prieſt's Intention*, though in both, he goes contrary to the general Senſe of your *Divines*, both then at *Trent*, and ever ſince; who looked on both Opinions of *Catharinus*, as condemned there, as is manifeſt by *Bellarmin*, *Suarez*, *Vaſquez*, *Valentia*, and others. But however, we may obſerve this from hence, What an excellent Rule of *Faith*, and judge of Controverſies the Decrees of your *Council* of *Trent* are, when there have been, and are ſtill, ſuch different Opinions, and eager Conteſts about the Senſe of them; that in one point *Dominicus à Soto* ſaith, the *Council* decreed of his ſide, *Catharinus* ſaith juſt the contrary, and yet both great *Divines* and preſent in the *Council*. And in this Doctrine of the *Intention* of the *Prieſt*, the general Apprehenſion then was, and hath been ſince, that *Catharinus* his Opinion was condemned there, but *Cardinal Palavicino* undertakes to prove the contrary. So that in the mean time here is like to be a fair *end* of Controverſies, by your pretended Infallible Decrees of *Councils*, when you are ſo far from being agreed, what the Senſe of them is: and yet *You*, *You* are the Men who ſay, *Controverſies* cannot be ended by the *Scripture*, becauſe there are ſuch Differences in the Senſe and Interpretation of it. Thus (we hope) we have ſufficiently vindicated his Lordſhip's firſt Charge of Error againſt your Pretended *General Councils*, confirmed by the *Pope*.

Before we come to the ſecond, you ſay, *His Lordſhip preſents ſuch a quaint Subtilty againſt the Pope's Right to confirm them, and the Neceſſity of his Confirmation, that you cannot well avoid the taking notice of it.* §. 6. P. 258. Thus then, you

you say, he argues, *No Council is confirmed till it be finished; and when it is finished, even before the Pope's Confirmation be put to it, either it hath erred, or it hath not erred: If it hath erred, the Pope ought not to confirm it; and if he do, it is a void Act: for no Power can make Falshood Truth: If it hath not erred, then it was true before the Pope confirmed it; so his Confirmation adds nothing but his own Assent.* As quaint a *Subtilty* as you call this, I am sure you are hard put to it, to return any satisfactory Answer to it. For you distinguish *of the Pope's joynt-consent, and of his actual Confirmation; in case*, say you, *the Pope either in Person, or by his Legates concur with the Council, then the Definition is unquestionably Infallible; but in case he doth not, then the actual Confirmation is necessary; but in case the Council err, the Pope ought not, and it is impossible he should confirm it; but if he doth not err, you grant it is true, before the Pope confirms it, but his Confirmation makes us infallibly certain that it is true.* This is the full force of your Answer, which by no means takes off the Difficulty, as will appear, 1. That by reason of the *Pope's* rare Appearance in *General Councils* (never in any that are unquestioned by the *Greek* and *Latin Churches*) that of his *joint-consent* cannot serve you; neither doth the Presence of his *Legates* suffice; for it is determined by *Bellarmine*, and proved by many Reasons, that though the *Pope's Legates* consent, yet if they have not the *express Sentence* of the *Pope*, the *Council* may err notwithstanding. So that still the *Pope's* actual Confirmation is supposed necessary, and that after the Definitions of the *Council* are passed. And this is the case which his Lordship speaks to: and for your answer to that, I say, 2. That in plain Terms you assert the *Pope's personal Infallibility*, which you disowned the Defence of before: for you say, In case the *Council err*, not only the *Pope* ought not to confirm it, but that it is impossible he should. Which, what is it other than to assert, that the *Pope* shall never err, though the *Council* may? Neither is it sufficient to say, *That he shall never err in confirming the Decrees of a Council:* for in this case the *Council* is supposed actually to *err* already, so that nothing of *Infallibility* can be at all supposed in the *Council;* and if the *Pope* be not considered in his personal Capacity, he might err as well as the *Council.* From whence it follows, since you suppose that a *Council* may err, but not the *Pope*, that you really judge the *Council* not to be Infallible, but the *Pope* only. 3. When you say, That if the *Council* erred not, the *Pope's* Confirmation doth not make the Definition true, but makes us infallibly certain that it is true. I enquire further, Whereon this *Infallible Certainty* depends? On a *Promise* made to the *Council*, or to the *Pope*? Not to the *Council*, for that you grant may err; but it is impossible the *Pope* should confirm it, therefore still it is some Promise of the *Pope's Infallibility* which makes Men *Infallibly certain* of the Truth of what the *Council* decrees. 4. To what purpose then are all those *Promises* and *Proofs* of *Scripture* which you produced concerning the *Council's Infallibility*, if, notwithstanding them, a *General Council may err?* Only the *Pope* shall never confirm it, and although it do not err, yet we cannot be *Infallibly certain* of it, but by the *Pope's* Confirmation. And let any reasonable Man judge, whether a promise of the *Pope's Infallibility*, though there be none at all concerning *Councils*, be not sufficient for all this? So that upon these Principles you take away the least degree of *Necessity* of any *Infallibility* in *Councils*, and resolve all into the *Pope's* Infallibility. For to what purpose are they *Infallible*, if we cannot be certain that any thing which they *decree* is true, but by the *Pope's* Confirmation?

De Concil. l. 2. c. 11.

6. 7. But that the *Pope's Confirmation* cannot make the Decrees of those you account *General Councils* Infallible, nor us *Infallibly certain* of the Truth of them,

them, his Lordſhip proves by another Evidence in matter of Fact, *viz. That the Pope hath erred by teaching in and by the Council of* Lateran (*confirmed by* Innocent 3.) *that Chriſt is preſent in the Sacrament by way of Tranſubſtantiation. Which* (his Lordſhip ſaith) *was never heard of in the Primitive Church, nor till the Council of* Lateran; *nor can it be proved out of Scripture; and taken properly cannot ſtand with the Grounds of Chriſtian Religion.* This you call *a ſtrange kind of proceeding to aſſert a Point of ſo great Importance, without ſolving or ſo much as taking Notice of the pregnant Proofs your Authors bring both out of Scripture and Fathers to the contrary of what he mainly affirms.* How pregnant thoſe Proofs are, we muſt examine afterwards; but his Lordſhip might juſtly leave it to thoſe who aſſert ſo ſtrange a Doctrine to produce their Evidence for it. Eſpecially, ſince it is confeſſed by ſo many among your ſelves, *That it could not be ſufficiently proved, either from Scripture or Fathers to bind Men to the Belief of it, till the Church had defined it in the Council of* Lateran: Since, *the more moderate and learned Men among your ſelves (Biſhop* Tonſtall *for one) have looked on that Definition as a raſh and inconſiderate Action.* Since, *the Engliſh Jeſuits confeſſed, that the Fathers did not meddle with the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.* Since, Suarez *confeſſeth that the Names uſed by the Fathers, are more accommodated to an accidental Change.* Since, *Father* Barns *acknowledgeth that Tranſubſtantiation is not the Faith of the Church, and that Scripture and Fathers may be ſufficiently expounded of a Supernatural Preſence of the Body of Chriſt without any Change in the Subſtance of the Elements.* For which he produces a large *Catalogue* of *Fathers* and others. Since therefore we have ſuch Confeſſions of your own Side, What need his Lordſhip (in a Controverſie ſo throughly ſifted as this hath been) bring all the *Teſtimonies* of both ſides which had been ſo often and ſo punctually examin'd by others? *At leaſt* (you ſay) *he ſhould have cleared how Tranſubſtantiation may be taken improperly, whereas of all the Words which the Church uſeth, there is none methinks leſs apt to a Metaphorical and figurative Senſe, than this of Tranſubſtantiation.* By which I ſee you are a Man who would really ſeem to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, and are afraid of nothing, but that it ſhould not be *impoſſible* enough for you to believe it. For his Lordſhip was only afraid, that though the Word it ſelf were groſs enough, yet ſome of the more refined and ſubtle Wits might *tranſubſtantiate* the Word it ſelf, and leave only the *Accidents* of it behind, by taking it in a *ſpiritual* Senſe; as *Bellarmine* confeſſes thoſe Words of St. *Bernard, In Sacramento exhiberi nobis veram carnis ſubſtantiam ſed ſpiritualitèr non carnalitèr*, have a true Senſe; but adds, *that the Word* Spiritualiter *muſt not be too often uſed*; and the *Council* of *Trent* would ſeem to provide an Evaſion by *Sacramentaliter*: and his Lordſhip not well knowing what they would have by ſuch Expreſſions, therefore he ſaith, *properly taken it cannot ſtand with the Grounds of Chriſtian Religion.* And for all thoſe Expreſſions, *Bellarmine* as well as the *Council* take it in as groſs a manner as you can deſire; and I think the *Phyſician* who wanted *Impoſſibilities enough to exerciſe his Faith*, needed nothing elſe to try it, but your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.* But you ſay, *The term indeed was firſt authoriſed by the Council of* Lateran, *as* ὁμοούσιος *by that of* Nice; *but for the thing it ſelf ſignified by this Term, which is a real Converſion of the Subſtance of Bread into the Body of Chriſt and of Wine into his Blood, 'tis clear enough, that it was ever held for a Divine Truth.* If you

P. 257.

P. 287.

Scotus in 4. *ſent. diſt.* 11. *q.* 3.
Gabr. Biel in Canon. Miſſæ. lect. 40.
Fiſher contr. captivit. Babyl. c. 9. *p.* 49.
Cajetan. in 3. *Qu.* 75. *A.* 1.
Petrus de Alliaco in 4. *ſent. q.* 6.
Tonſtall de verit. corp. Chriſti, &c. p. 46.
Eraſmus in 1 Cor. 7.
Ferus in Matth. 26.
Apud Epiſcop. Elienſ. reſp. ad Apol. Cardinal. Bellarm. cap. 1. *p.* 7.
Suarez in 3. *diſp.* 50. *ſect.* 3.

Barns Catholico-Romanus Pacificus. MS. f. 7. *liter. C.*

P. 288.

prove

prove but that, I will never quarrel with you about the *Term*, call it *Tranſubſtantiation* or what you will; but we do not think it ſo clear, as not to want Proofs ſtronger for the Belief of it, than all the Repugnancies of Senſe and Reaſon are againſt it. For it is a vain thing for you to attempt to prove ſo unreaſonable a Doctrine as this is, by ſome few lame Citations of *Fathers*, unleſs you can firſt prove that the *Authority* of them is ſo great, as to make me believe any thing they ſay, though never ſo contrary to Senſe and Reaſon. If you could bring ſome Places of the *Fathers* to prove that we muſt renounce abſolutely the Judgment of Senſe, believe things moſt contradictious to Reaſon, yet you muſt firſt ſhew that the *Evidence* they bring is greater than that of *Senſe* or *Reaſon*. Or that I am more bound to believe them, than I am to believe the greateſt Evidence of *Senſe* or *Reaſon*. When you ſay, *In theſe Caſes we muſt ſubmit Reaſon to Faith*; we acknowledge it, when it is no manifeſt Contradiction, in things ſo obvious to Senſe or Reaſon, that the aſſerting it, will deſtroy the uſe of our *Faculties* and make us turn abſolute *Scepticks*; for then *Faith*, muſt be deſtroyed too. For may not a Man queſtion, as well, whether his hearing may not deceive him as his Sight, and by that means he may queſtion all the *Tradition* of the *Church*, and what becometh of his *Faith* then? And if his *Sight* might deceive him in a proper object of it, Why might not the *Apoſtle's* Sight deceive them in the *Body* of Chriſt being riſen from the Grave? And if a Man may be bound to believe that to be falſe which his Senſe judges to be true, what Aſſurance can be had of any *Miracles* which were wrought to confirm the *Chriſtian Doctrine?* And therefore his Lordſhip might well ſay, *That Tranſubſtantiation is not conſiſtent with the Grounds of Chriſtian Religion.* But of this I have ſpoken already. That which I am now upon, is not how far *Reaſon* is to be ſubmitted to *Divine Authority*, in caſe of *Certainty* that there is a *Divine Revelation* for what I am to believe; but how far it is to be renounced, when all the Evidence which is brought is from the *Authority* of the *Fathers*? So that the Queſtion in ſhort is, Whether there be greater Evidence that I am bound to believe the *Fathers* in a matter contrary to Senſe and Reaſon, or elſe to adhere to the *Judgment* of *them* though in Oppoſition to the *Father's* Authority? And ſince you do not grant their *Authority* immediately *Divine*; ſince you pretend not to Places as clear out of them as the Judgement of *Senſe* and *Reaſon* is in this caſe; ſince you dare not ſay, that all the *Fathers* are as much agreed about it, as the *Senſes* of all Mankind are about the matter in Diſpute; I think with Men who have not already renounced all that looks like Reaſon, this will be no matter of Controverſie at all. From whence it follows, that ſuppoſing the *Fathers* were as clear for you (as they are againſt you) in this Subject, yet that would not be enough to perſwade us to believe ſo many *Contradictions* as *Tranſubſtantiation* involves in it meerly becauſe the *Fathers* delivered it to us. I ſpeak not this, as though I did at all fear the Clearneſs of any *Teſtimony* you can produce out of them, but to ſhew that you take not a competent Way to prove ſuch a Doctrine as *Tranſubſtantiation* is. For nothing but a ſtronger Evidence than that of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, can be judged ſufficient to overſway the clear Dictates of both.

Part. 1. ch. 5. ſect. 7.

§. 8. This being premiſed, I come to conſider the clear Evidence you produce out of *Antiquity* for this Doctrine, and ſince you pretend to ſo much choice in referring us to *Bellarmine* and *Gualtierus* for more, I muſt either much diſtruſt your Judgment, or ſuppoſe theſe the *cleareſt* to be had in them, and therefore the Examination of theſe will ſave the Labour of ſearching

ſearching for the reſt. And yet it is the great Unhappineſs of your Cauſe, that there is ſcarce one of all the Teſtimonies you make uſe of, but either its Authority is ſlighted by ſome of your own *Writers*, or ſufficient *Reaſons* given againſt it by many of ours: Your firſt is *of St.* Cyprian (*or at leaſt an Author of thoſe firſt Ages of the Church*) *who ſpeaking of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, ſaith, This common Bread changed into Fleſh and Blood giveth Life. And again, The Bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples being changed not in its outward Form or Semblance, but in its inward Nature or Subſtance, by the Omnipotency of the Word is made Fleſh.* As to this Teſtimony there are two things to be conſidered, the *Authority*, and the *Meaning* of it. For its *Authority*, you ſeem doubtful your ſelf, whether S. *Cyprian*'s or no (ſince *Bellarmine* and others of your own deny it) but *at leaſt* you ſay, *An Author of thoſe firſt Ages of the Church*, but you bring no Evidence at all for it. *Bellarmine* grants that he is younger than St. *Auguſtine*; and others ſay that none mention him for 800 Years after St. *Cyprian's* time. And the abundance of *Barbariſms* which that Book is ſo full fraught with, manifeſt, that it is of a much later *Extraction* than the time it pretends to. But the matter ſeems to be now out of Queſtion; ſince the Book is extant in the *King of France's Library*, with an *Inſcription* to *Pope Adrian*, and a *MS.* of it is in the *Library* of *All-Souls* in *Oxford*, with the ſame Inſcription, and the Name of *Arnaldus Bonavillacenſis*; who was St. *Bernard's* Co-temporary, and lived in the twelfth *Century*. And thoſe who have taken the Pains to compare this Book with what is extant of the ſame Author in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, not only obſerve the very ſame *Barbariſms*, but the ſame Conceptions and Expreſſions about the *Sacrament*, which the other hath. Although therefore I might juſtly reject this Teſtimony as in all Reſpects incompetent, yet I ſhall not take that Advantage of you; but, ſuppoſing him an *Author* as ancient as you would have him, I ſay he proves not the thing you bring him for. For which, two Things muſt be enquired into. 1. What kind of *Preſence* of *Chriſt* he aſſerts in the *Sacrament*. 2. What Change he ſuppoſes to be made in the Elements. For your Doctrine aſſerts, *That there is a Converſion of the whole Subſtance of Bread and Wine into the Subſtance of the natural Body and Blood of Chriſt, and that this conveniently, properly, and moſt aptly is called Tranſubſtantiation.* Now if this Author ſpeaks wholly of a *real* but *ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt*, and if he aſſerts that the *Subſtance of Bread and Wine do remain* ſtill, you can have no Pretence at all left, that this *Author* aſſerts your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. For the firſt, he expreſly ſaith, *That theſe things muſt not be underſtood after a carnal Senſe*: viz. *unleſs ye eat the fleſh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye ſhall have no life in you; for Chriſt himſelf hath ſaid, His Words are ſpirit and life.* And nothing can be more evident, than that this *Author* ſpeaks not of any *corporeal*, but *ſpiritual Preſence of Chriſt*, by the *Effects* which he attributes to it, calling it *inconſumptibilem cibum, that Food which cannot be conſumed*; and the *Reaſon* he gives of it, is, becauſe *it feeds to eternal Life*, and therefore he ſaith it is *immortalitatis alimonia, that which nouriſheth to Immortality*; which cannot poſſibly be conceived of the *corporal Preſence* of *Chriſt*, ſince you confeſs the *Body of Chriſt* remains no longer in the *Body* than the *Accidents* of the *Bread* and *Wine* do. And after he tells us, *What the feeding upon the Fleſh of Chriſt is*, viz. *our Hunger and deſire of remaining in Chriſt, by which the Sweetneſs of his Love, is ſo imprinted and melted as it were within us, that*

Serm. de Cœnâ Domini.

De æmiſſ. grat. l. 6. c. 2.

James of the Fathers. *p.* 12.

Albertinus de Euchariſt. Sacramento, l. 2. p. 381.

Sed in cogitationibus hujuſmodi, caro & ſanguis non prodeſt quidquam; quia ſicut ipſe magiſter expoſuit, verba hæc ſpiritus & vita ſunt: nec carnalis ſenſus ad intellectum tantæ profunditatis penetrat, niſi fides accedat, Auctor de Cana Domini, ſect. 4.

Eſus igitur carnis hujus quædam aviditas eſt, & quoddam deſiderium manendi in ipſo per quod ſic imprimimus, & eliquamus in

nobis dulcedinem charitatis, ut hæreat palato & viſceribus ſapor dilectionis infuſus, penitrans & imbuens omnes animæ corporiſque receſſus. Id. ſect. 9

Ut ſciremus quod manſio noſtra in ipſo ſit manducatio, & potus quaſi quædam incorporatio, ſubjectis obſequiis, voluntatibus junctis, affectibus unitis. Id. ib.

Et non tam corporali quam ſpirituali tranſitione Chriſto nos uniri. Sect. 4.

Hæc quotics agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuimus, ſed fide ſincerâ panem ſanctum frangimus & partimur. Id. ſect. 18.

the ſavour of it may remain in our Palate and Bowels, penitrating and diffuſing it ſelf through all the Receſſes of Soul and Body. And ſo juſt before he ſaith, *Chriſt did, Spirituali nos inſtruere documento, inſtruct us by a ſpiritual Leſſon, that we might know, that our abiding in him is our eating of him, and our drinking a kind of Incorporation, by the Humility of our Obedience, the Conjunction of our Wills, the Union of our Affections.* And in another Place denies, *That there is any corporal Union between Chriſt and us, but a ſpiritual*; and therefore adds afterwards, *As often as we do theſe things, we do not ſharpen our Teeth to bite, but break and divide the holy Bread by a ſincere Faith.* All which and many other Places in that Author make it plain, that he doth not ſpeak of ſuch a *corporal Preſence* as you imagine, but of a *real* but *ſpiritual Preſence* of *Chriſt*, whereby the Souls of Believers have an intimate Union and Conjunction with Chriſt, which he calls *Societatem germaniſſimam*, in which reſpect they have *Communion* with the *Body of Chriſt*. But I need mention but one place more to explain his meaning, in which he fully aſſerts the *ſpiritual Preſence* of *Chriſt*, and withal that the ſubſtance of the Elements doth remain. *That immortal Nouriſhment is given us, which differs from common Food, that it retains the Nature of a corporeal Subſtance, but proving the Preſence of a Divine Power, by its inviſible Efficiency.* So that what Preſence of Divine Power there is, is ſhewed in regard of the *Effects* of it, not in regard of any *ſubſtantial Change* of the *Bread* into the *Body of Chriſt*; for in reference to that *Efficiency* he calls it, *immortal Nouriſhment*, and afterwards, *That as common Bread is the Life of the Body, ſo this ſuper-ſubſtantial Bread is the Life of the Soul, and Health of the Mind.*

Sed immortalitatis alimonia datur, à communibus cibis differens, corporalis ſubſtantiæ retinens ſpeciem, ſed virtutis divinæ inviſibili efficientiâ probans adeſſe præſentiam. Id. ſ. 2.

Id. ſect. 6.

But I know you will quarrel with me for rendring, *corporalis ſubſtantiæ retinens ſpeciem*, *by retaining the Nature of a corporal Subſtance*; for you would fain have *Species* to ſignifie only the *Accidents* of a *corporeal Subſtance* to remain. This being therefore the main thing in diſpute, if I can evince that *Species* ſignifies not the bare *external Accidents*, but the *Nature* of *a corporeal Subſtance*, then this Author will be ſo far from aſſerting, that he will appear *point blank* againſt your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Now I ſhall prove that *Species* was not taken then, for the meer *external Shape and Figure*, but for the ſolid Body it ſelf eſpecially of ſuch Things as were deſigned for Nouriſhment. Thence in the *Civil Law* we read of the *ſpecies annonariæ*, and of the *ſpecies publicæ*, *largitionales*, and *fiſcales*; and thoſe who had the care of Corn are ſaid to be *Curatores ſpecierum*; and thence very often in the *Codes* of *Juſtinian* and *Theodoſius*, there is mention of the *ſpecies vini*, *ſpecies olei*, *ſpecies tritici*. But leſt you ſhould think, it is only uſed in this Senſe in the Civil *Law*, not only *Caſſiodore* and *Vegetius* uſe it in the ſame Senſe for the *ſpecies tritici*, and *ſpecies annonariæ*; but, that which comes home to our purpoſe, St. *Ambroſe* uſes it where it is impoſſible to be taken for the meer *external Accidents*, but muſt be underſtood of the *Subſtance* it ſelf: ſpeaking of *Chriſt's* being deſired to change the Water into Wine he thus expreſſes it, *Ut rogatus ad nuptias aquæ ſuſtantiam in vini ſpeciem commutaret*, that he would change the Subſtance of Water into the *Species* of Wine; Will you ſay, that *Chriſt* turned it only in the *external Accidents* and not the *Nature* of it? So when St. *Auſtin* ſays, that Chriſt was the ſame Food to the *Jews* and us, *ſignificatione non ſpecie*, he oppoſes *Species* to a meer *Type*, and therefore

Cod. Theod. de curſu publ. & leg. 67. Arcad. l. ult. De muncrib. & honor. Caſſiod. l. 12. Vegetius de re milit. l. 3. c. 3.

Ambroſ. ſerm. 21. de die ſancto Epiphan.

Auguſtin. in Pſalm. 82.

therefore it imports the *Subſtance* and reality of the thing. And ſo the *Tranſlator* of *Origen* oppoſes the *regeneratio in ſpecie* to the *Baptiſmus in ænigmate*, and the *manna in ænigmate* to the *manna in ſpecie*: in both which, being oppoſed to the *Figure* it denotes the *Reality*. And one of thoſe *Authors* whom you cite, in the very ſame *Book* and *Chapter* which you cite, uſes *ſpecies ſanguinis* for the *ſubſtance of Blood*, for he oppoſes it to the *ſimilitudo ſanguinis*; for when the Perſon objects, and ſays, *That after the Cup is conſecrated* ſpeciem ſanguinis non video, *I do not ſee the Nature or Subſtance of Blood*; he anſwers him, *Sed ſimilitudinem habet, But it hath the reſemblance of it*; *for as* (ſaith he) *there is the Similitude of his Death, ſo there is the Similitude of his Blood.* Theſe may be ſufficient to ſhew that *ſpecies corporalis ſubſtantiæ*, does not relate to the *external Shape and Figure*, but to the *Nature* and *Reality* of it: So that his meaning is, although it remains ſtill the ſame *Subſtance of Bread and Wine*; yet there is ſuch an inviſible *Efficiency* of *Divine Power* going along with the *uſe* of it, as makes it to nouriſh the *Souls* of Men to eternal Life.

Origen. hom. 7. in Num.

Ambroſ. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.

§. 9. And now it will be no matter of Difficulty at all to Anſwer the Places you bring out of this Author. The firſt is, *This common Bread changed into Fleſh and Blood giveth Life.* But how little this Place makes to your purpoſe is eaſie to diſcern, becauſe we do not deny a *Sacramental Change* of the *Bread* into the *Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt*, but only that *ſubſtantial Change* which you aſſert, but that Author ſufficiently diſproves, even in that very Sentence from whence thoſe Words are cited, if you had given them us at large. *For*, ſaith he, *that common Bread being chang'd into Fleſh and Blood, procures Life and Increaſe to our Bodies; and therefore from the uſual Effect of Things, the weakneſs of our Faith is helped, being taught by a ſenſible Argument, that the effect of eternal Life is in the viſible Sacraments, and that we are not united to Chriſt ſo much by a Corporal as Spiritual Union.* In which Words he compares the *Sign* and the *thing ſignified* together: that as the *Bread* being Sacramentally changed into the *Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt*, doth yet really give *Life* and *Nouriſhment* to our *Bodies*, (which certainly is far enough from that *ſubſtantial Change* into the *Body* of *Chriſt*, which you aſſert) ſo by that effect of the *Sign* it ſelf upon our *Bodies*, our *Faith* is helped the better to underſtand the *Efficacy* of the thing ſignified upon our *Souls*, in order to eternal Life; there being as *real*, though *ſpiritual Union* between *Chriſt* and *Believers*, as there is between the *Bread* and our *Bodies*. And that this is the plain and unſophiſticated meaning of this *Author* in theſe Words, I dare appeal to the impartial Judgment of any intelligent Reader. By which we ſee, Thoſe firſt Words of the *change* of the *Bread* into the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, muſt be underſtood of a *ſacramental*, and not a *ſubſtantial Change*. But your other is the great and (as *Bellarmine* thinks) *unanſwerable Place*; which you thus render, *The Bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, being changed not in its outward Form and Semblance, but in its inward Nature and Subſtance, by the Omnipotency of the Word is made Fleſh.* As to which place, I muſt tell you firſt, that there are very ſhrewd Suſpicions of ſome unhandſome Dealings with it; for ſome great *Criticks* have aſſured us, that the Place is corrupted, and that the ancient *MSS.* read it quite otherwiſe, *non effigie, nec natura mutatus*, which is ſo far from your purpoſe, that it is directly againſt it; and this ſeems far more conſonant to the following Words; *For*, ſaith he, *as in the Perſon of Chriſt, the Humanity was ſeen, but the Divinity lay hid; ſo*

Panis iſte communis in carnem & ſanguinem mutatus procurat vitam & incrementum corporibus; idſoq; ex conſueto rerum effectu, fidei noſtræ adjuta infirmitas, ſenſibili argumento edocta eſt, viſibilibus ſacramentis ineſſe vitæ æternæ effectum, & non tam corporali quam ſpirituali tranſitione Chriſto nos uniri. Id. ſect. 5.

Panis iſte quem Dominus diſcipulis porrigebat, non effigie, ſed naturâ mutatus, omnipotentiâ verbi factus eſt caro. Id ſect. 6.

Et ſicut in perſonâ Chriſti humanitas videbatur, & latebat divinitas; ita Sacra-

mento visibili, ineffabiliter divina se infudit essentia. Ib.

in the visible Sacrament, the divine Essence doth infuse it self after an unexpressible manner. In which it is considerable, how he doth parallel these two together; for as the *humane Nature* of *Christ* did *substantially* remain, notwithstanding the *Presence* of the *divine Nature*, so to make good the Parallel, the *substance of Bread and Wine* must remain too, and that because he doth not say, That the *Body* of *Christ* is present, which might exclude the *Substance* of the *Elements*, but the *divine Essence*, which only imports a *spiritual* and *real Presence.* And when he saith, *That the Bread is neither changed in its Form or Nature, when by the Omnipotency of God it is made Flesh* (*i. e.* as to the real Communion which Believers have of the *Body* of *Christ*; which is an Act of *divine Power* as well as *Goodness*) he saith no more, than *Theodoret*, *Ephraim*, and *Gelasius* do expressly speak. For,

Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταλαι φύσεως. μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τὴν εἶδος καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτά, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Theodoret. Dialog. 2. Tom. 1. p. 85.

saith *Theodoret*, *The mystical Symbols after Consecration, go not out of their own Nature, but remain in their former Substance, Figure, and Shape, and are visible and tangible as they were before?* Which Words, considering the Occasion and Importance of them, are so express, as nothing can be more. And in his former *Dialogue*, he

Οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προσθεικώς. Id. Dialog. 1.

gives an account, *Why the external Symbols are called by the Names of the Body and Blood of Christ, not by changing their Natures, but by superadding Grace to Nature*; which is the same with that our Author saith here, *Though neither Figure nor Nature be changed, yet by God's Omnipotency it is made Flesh*; that πρόδηλος χάρις, in *Theodoret*, and this *omnipotentia Dei*, here, importing the same Thing. To the same purpose *Ephraim* the

Τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα χειρὶ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτι. Apud Photium in Biblioth. Cod. 229. p. 794.

famous *Patriarch* of *Antioch* speaks in *Photius*. *For*, saith he, *the Body of Christ, which is received by Believers doth not lose its sensible Substance; and yet is inseparable from spiritual Grace.* And so *Gelasius*, as

Certè Sacramenta quæ sumimus, corporis & sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Gelas. tract. adverss. Eutych. & Nestor.

plainly as either of the foregoing, asserts, *That the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we receive, are a divine Thing, through and by which we are made Partakers of the divine Nature* (which answers to the *Omnipotency of God, by which it is made Flesh*, in our Author) *and yet it doth not cease to be the Substance, or Nature of Bread and Wine* (which is the same with the former Clause, *That the Bread is not changed in Figure or Nature.*) So that the ancient reading of this Place is not only consonant to the other Parts of his Discourse, but asserts no more than is in express Terms said by genuine and unquestionable Authors; who plainly overthrew your Doctrine of *Transubstantiation.* For these Testimonies being so express for the remaining of the *Substance of Bread and Wine* after Consecration, are of far greater Force against it, than the highest Expressions concerning the Change of the *Elements* can make for it. For in these they speak their *Judgments*, clearly and punctually against *Hereticks*, and speak that which is absolutely inconsistent with *Transubstantiation*; but in their other they speak *mystically* and *sacramentally*; and their most lofty Expressions, must be understood by the Nature and Design of their Discourse, which is to represent *symbolical* Things in the most lively and affecting manner. But when our *Adversaries* are urged with the former Testimonies, they then tell us, *That Substance and Nature are not always taken properly, but sometimes at large for the Accidents or use of things*: but although this can never be applied to the Places of the foregoing *Authors*, in their *Disputations* with the

Eutychian

Eutychian Hereticks; yet from thence we are furniſhed by themſelves with a further Anſwer to this Place. So that although we admit of the preſent reading, *non effigie, ſed naturâ mutatus*, yet ſince by their own Confeſſion *Nature* doth not always import the *Subſtance* of a thing, they cannot in any Juſtice or Reaſon from hence inferr a *ſubſtantial Change*. Let them then take their choice, Whether are the Words of *Subſtance* and *Nature* in the *Fathers* always to be taken properly, or no? If they muſt be taken ſo, we have three unqueſtionable Teſtimonies of ancient *Fathers* directly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, and we only loſe the Teſtimony of an *uncertain Author*, built upon an *uncertain Reading*, and contrary to other *Expreſſions* in the ſame Book: If they be not, then from the change of *Nature* here expreſſed, no ſuch thing as a *ſubſtantial Change* can be inferred, but only *accidental*, upon Conſecration, in regard of the *Sacramental Uſe* and Effect of it. Which that it is nothing Strange in *Antiquity*, might be eaſily proved, but that our *Adverſaries* Confeſſion ſaves me the Labour of it.

The ſecond *Teſtimony*, is of *Gregory Nyſſen*, out of whoſe *Catechetical Oration* you produce theſe Words, *With good Reaſon do we believe, that the Bread being ſanctified by God's Word, is changed into the Body of the Word of God: and a little after, The Nature of the Things we ſee being tranſ-elemented into him.* I might here tell you, What Exceptions are taken againſt this Book, as not being genuine, not only by *Proteſtants* (as *Fronto Ducæus* would have it, becauſe of theſe Expreſſions) but by others too. But I will not inſiſt on this, becauſe I ſee no ſufficient reaſon to queſtion the *Authority* of it; yet I know not how you can excuſe it from ſome *Interpolations*, ſince he therein mentions *Severus*, an *heretical Acephaliſt*, who lived not till after *Gregory*'s time; yet for the main of the Book, I ſay as *Caſaubon* doth, that it is, *Opus planè eximium ſi paucos nævos excipias*, An *excellent Piece* in the general, and becoming its Author, ſome few *Eſcapes* excepted. And the Deſign of it being to ſhew, that *Chriſtian Religion* hath nothing abſurd or unreaſonable in it, it would be very ſtrange that he ſhould aſſert ſo abſurd and unreaſonable a Doctrine, as *Tranſubſtantiation* is. But there is nothing tending to that in the Places cited, but only the uſe of thoſe two Words, μεταποιεῖσθαι and μεταρυθμίζειν; for the main force of all you ſay, depends upon them. So that if we can give a good Account of them, without any *Tranſubſtantiation*, there remains no Difficulty at all in theſe Words of *Gregory Nyſſen*. For, we deny not that there is a *change* in the Elements after *Conſecration*, but we ſay, It is a *Sacramental*, and you, That it is a *ſubſtantial Change*, and this you offer to prove from theſe two Words here uſed in Reference to the *Euchariſt*. The Argument commonly formed by your Authors from the firſt Words, is, *Whatſoever is changed, is not what it was before*; which we readily grant, ſo far as the *change* is; but ſtill it remains to be proved, that the *Subſtance* is *changed* in it ſelf. But it were eaſie to ſhew, that the Word μεταποιεῖσθαι, in multitudes of Places of the *Fathers* is uſed for an *accidental* and *relative Change*, and *Gregory Nyſſen* himſelf very frequently uſes the Word, where it is capable of no other Senſe, as when he ſaith, *Of the ſhining of* Moſes *his Face, that it was* ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐνδοξότερον μεταποίησις, *a change to that which was more glorious*; and when he affirms, *the Souls of men by the Doctrine of Chriſt*, μεταποιηθῆναι πρὸς τὸ θειότερον, *to be changed into that which is more divine*. And in this ſame *Catechetical Oration* he uſes it ſeveral times to the ſame Purpoſe, *about the change which ſhall be in glorified Bodies*, and the *change of Men's Souls by Regeneration*: But I need not inſiſt more on this, ſince I produced before the Confeſſion of *Suarez*, that *ſuch Expreſſions*

p. 10.

Not. in Greg. Nyſſ. p. 45.

If. Caſaub. Not. in Greg. 1. Epiſt. ad Euſtath. &c. p. 99.

Καλῶς ἔν γε νῦν τὸν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ θεῷ διαζόμενον ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα τὸ θεῖον λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομαι, πρὸς ἐκεῖνο μεταρυθμιζόμενος τῶν φαινομένων τὴν φύσιν. Gregor. Nyſſen. orat Catechet. cap. 37. Tom. 3.

De vitâ Moſis. Hom. 1. in Cant. Orat. Catech. c. 37. *c.* 40.

Expreſſions are more accommodated to an accidental Mutation. Neither is there any more Strength in the other Word, μεταστοιχειῶσις, though *Suarez* thinks this comes nearer the Matter, and you confidently ſay, *What can here be ſignified by tranſ-elementation of the Nature of the outward Element, but that which the Church now ſtiles Tranſubſtantiation?* I will therefore ſhew you, what elſe is ſignified by that Word which *Gregory* uſed, which cannot be properly rendred *tranſ-elementation*; for μεταστοιχειῶσιν, doth not come from the Noun στοιχεῖον, but from the Verb στοιχειῶν, and the *Greeks* expound στοιχεῖῶν by τυπῶν, σχηματίζειν: and ſo μεταστοιχεῖωσιν by μεταπλάττειν, μεταχηματίζειν, μεταπλάσσειν; as you may ſee in *Suidas*, and others. So that it imports not a *ſubſtantial*, but *an accidental Change* too: and in that Senſe *Gregory Nyſſen* uſes it to expreſs *Regeneration* by, τοὺς ἐξ παλιγγενεσίας, μεταστοιχειωμένους, thoſe who are *tranſ-elemented by Regeneration*; Would you ſay, thoſe who are *tranſubſtantiated* by it? So that neither of theſe Teſtimonies import any more than that there is a *Sacramental Change* in the *Elements* after *Conſecration*, by which Believers are made Partakers of the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*; which is no more than we aſſert, and falls far ſhort of your Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

Epiſt. Canon.

§. 11. Your third Teſtimony is, of S. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, which you would make us believe, *is ſo full and clear, that no Catholick could expreſs his own, or the Churches belief of this Myſtery in more full, plain, and effectual Terms:* Neither ſhall I here ſtand to diſpute the Reaſons on which thoſe *Myſtagogical Diſcourſes* under his Name are queſtioned, but proceed to the Conſideration of the Teſtimony it ſelf. Which lies in theſe Words, *He that changed Water into Wine by his ſole Will* (*at* Cana *in* Galilee) *doth he not deſerve our Belief, that he hath alſo changed wine into blood? Wherefore let us receive with all aſſurance of Faith, the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt, Seeing under the Species of Bread the Body is given, and under the Species of Wine his Blood is given, &c. knowing and holding for certain, that the Bread which we ſee, is not Bread* (*tho' it ſeem to the Taſte to be Bread*) *but the Body of Jeſus Chriſt; likewiſe that the Wine which we ſee* (*though to the Senſe it ſeem to be Wine*) *is not Wine for all that, but the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt.* This Teſtimony you have patched together out of ſeveral Places in that *Oration*, very warily leaving out that, which would ſufficiently clear the meaning of S. *Cyril* in the Words you cite out of him. For it is evident, that his Deſign is to perſwade the *Catechumens* (from whom the *myſterious Preſence* of *Chriſt's Body* in the *Sacrament* was wont to be concealed) that the Bread and Wine were not *meer common Elements*, but that they were deſigned for a greater and higher Uſe to *exhibit the Body and Blood of Chriſt to Believers.* And therefore he ſaith expreſly, *Do not conſider them as meer Bread and Wine, for they are the Body and Blood of Chriſt, according to his own Words.* By which it is plain he ſpeaks of the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*, as *ſacramentally*, and not *corporeally* preſent; for he doth not oppoſe the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*, to the *Subſtance* of *Bread and Wine*, but to *meer Bread and Wine, i. e.* that they ſhould not look on the Bread and Wine as *naked Signs*, but as *ſigna efficacia*, and that there is a *real Preſence* of *Chriſt* in and with them to the *Souls* of *Believers*. And this is it which he ſaith, *That they ought not to make a queſtion of, ſince Chriſt ſaid, This is my Body, and this is my Blood. For if he could by his Will turn the Water into Wine, ſhall we not believe him, that he can change his Wine into his Blood?* And after adds, *That under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, the Body and Blood of Chriſt is given, that thou mayeſt be a Partaker both of his body and blood.* You render this *under the ſpecies or form of bread and wine*, in *Cyril* it is ἐν τύπῳ, in that which is *the*

Cyril. Catech. Myſtagog. 4.

Μὴ πρόσεχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. Id. *ib.*

Figure

Figure or Repreſentation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt; for τύπος is not taken in your Senſe for the *external Accidents*, which you call the *Species*, but for that which doth *figure* or *repreſent*; for in his next Catechetical Diſcourſe he calls the *Bread and Wine*, ἀντίτυπον σώματος καὶ αἵματος χριστοῦ, *the Figure of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, and this *Theophylact*, and thoſe who aſſert *Tranſubſtantiation*, deny that the *Bread* and *Wine* are ἀντίτυπα. For where there are ἀντίτυπα, there muſt be ἀληθύπα, which muſt anſwer to them; if *Cyril* therefore makes the *bread and wine* to be ἀντίτυπα, he muſt make the *body and blood of Chriſt* to be the ἀληθύπα, and conſequently they cannot be the *very body and blood of Chriſt* in your Senſe. This ἀντίτυπον and τύπος here have the ſame *Signification*, and are the ſame with σύμβολον, and ſo when he ſaith; ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἶνος δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα, his meaning cannot be, under the *Accidents of bread and wine*, the *body and blood of Chriſt* is *preſent* in your Senſe, for he ſpeaks of ſuch a *Preſence* as hath Relation to the *Receiver*, and not the *Elements*; for he ſaith, *Under the Type of bread and wine, the body and blood of Chriſt is given to thee.* For otherwiſe it had been far more to his Purpoſe to have ſaid abſolutely, that under the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, the *body and blood of Chriſt is ſubſtantially preſent*; but, when he ſaith only *that it is given to the Receiver*, it doth not belong to ſuch a *corporeal Preſence* as you dream of, but to ſuch a *real and ſpiritual Preſence*, whereby Believers are made Partakers of the *body and blood of Chriſt.* And therefore *Chriſt* is in this well explained by that of *Tertullian*, *Hoc eſt corpus meum, id eſt, figura corporis mei, This is my body*, i.e. *the figure of my body*, which is the ſame with τύπος; and by that of S. *Auſtin*, *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc eſt corpus meum, cum daret ſignum corporis ſui, Chriſt did not ſcruple to ſay, This is my body, when he gave the figure of his body*: And elſewhere ſpeaking of *Judas* his being preſent *ad convivium in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram diſcipulis commendavit & tradidit*, at that Supper in which *Chriſt commended and delivered to his Diſciples the figure of his body and blood.* So that hitherto there is nothing in the Teſtimony of *Cyril*, importing *Tranſubſtantiation.* But it may be you think, there is more force in it, where he ſaith; That *we muſt not believe our Senſes, that that which we ſee is not bread, tho' it ſeem to the taſte to be ſo, &c.* As to which I anſwer, that this Place of *Cyril* muſt be explained by that which went before it, wherein he ſaid, *That we muſt not judge it to be meer bread and meer wine.* For, although *Senſe* be a ſufficient Judge of that which it *ſees* and *taſtes*, yet it cannot be a *Judge* of that which is exhibited by that which is *ſeen* and *taſted*; therefore, though to the *taſte*, it ſeems to be nothing but common *bread and wine*, yet they ought to believe that it is the Communion of the *body and blood of Chriſt.* So that this is not to be underſtood of the *Elements* themſelves, but of the *myſtical* and *ſacramental Nature* of them. And, as *Cardinal Perron* hath obſerved, *It is an uſual thing, for the greater Emphaſis ſake, to deny that to be, which is meant only reſpectively; or to expreſs the Affirmation and Denyal of ſome Qualities, by the Affirmation or Denyal of the Subſtances themſelves*: As in that of *Tully*, *Memmius ſemper eſt Memmius*, for one; that in S. *Ambroſe*, *Ego non ſum ego*, for the other: And in many other Inſtances to the ſame Purpoſe, in which he ſaith, *Though the Subſtance ſeem to be denied, yet only ſome Quality is underſtood by it.* So when *Cyril* here ſaith, *That bread is not bread, &c.* he means not by it any alteration of the *Subſtance* of it, but that it is not that *common bread* which it was before, and as our ſight and taſte judge it ſtill to be. And what he ſaith here of the *bread* in the *Euchariſt*, he ſaid the ſame before of the *Chriſm*, where he compares them both together. *For* (ſaith he) *do not think that to be meer Oyntment; for as the bread of the Euchariſt after*

Catech. Myſt. 5.

Theophyl. in Marc. 14.

Tertul. c. Marcion. l. 4. c. 40. Auguſt. c. Adimant.

Comment. in Pſal. 3.

Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐνᾶνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ἁγιασίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τὸ ἁγίας πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα χριστοῦ· ὅτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μύρον ἐπίχριστον, ἀλλὰ χριστὸν χάρισμα καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίας, παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργητικὸν γεγόμενον. Cyril. Myſtag. 3. p. 235.

after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer Bread, but the Body of Chriſt; ſo this holy Oyntment, is no longer meer, or common Oyntment, after it is conſecrated, but a Gift of Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit; being effectual through the Preſence of his divine Nature. May not you then as well prove a *Tranſubſtantiation* here as in the *Euchariſt*, ſince he Parallels theſe two ſo exactly together? And ſo elſewhere he ſpeaks concerning *Baptiſm, That they ought not to look on it as meer Water, but as ſpiritual Grace*; ſo that he means not a *ſubſtantial Change* in the *Euchariſt*, any more than in the other, but only *relative* and *ſacramental.*

Catech. Illum. 3.

§. 12. *Ambroſ. de his qui initiantur. c.* 9.

Neither can any thing more be inferred from your Teſtimonies out of your laſt Author S. *Ambroſe*, there being nothing at all in the Words you produce, which implies any *ſubſtantial Change* in the Elements; for, although it be only *ſacramental*, yet it may be truly ſaid, *It is no longer that which Nature hath framed it (viz.* meer Bread and Wine*) but that which the Benediction of Conſecration hath made it to be:* Which I grant to be the Body and Blood of Chriſt, but not in your groſs and corporeal Senſe. So S. *Chryſoſtome* ſaith of Baptiſm, *That its Virtue is ſo great, it doth not ſuffer men to be men*; Will you therefore ſay, it *tranſubſtantiates* them? But you add further out of him, that he ſaith, *The force of Benediction is greater than that of Nature, ſeeing by that Nature it ſelf is often changed?* And ſo we aſſert too, that the force of Benediction far exceeds that of *Nature*, which can ſo alter *common Elements*, as by the uſe of them, to make us Partakers of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. Your laſt Words are out of the Counterfeit S. *Ambroſe*, which are only general, *viz. this bread, is bread before the Words of the Sacrament, but when Conſecration comes, of bread, it is made the fleſh of Chriſt.* This we deny not, but the Diſpute is about the Senſe in which it is made ſo, whether by a *ſubſtantial Change* of the *Bread* into the *Body* of *Chriſt*; and that this cannot be his Author's Meaning, appears by thoſe known Words which are uſed by him, ſpeaking of the Efficacy of Chriſt's Power in the *Sacrament*; whereby he can make, *ut ſint quæ erant & in aliud commutentur, that they might be what they were, and yet be changed into ſomething elſe.* And, although a great Controverſie hath been raiſed about the reading of theſe Words, yet this *reading* is not only juſtified by many Authors of competent Antiquity, but by two *MSS.* in the *King of France's Library*, beſides many others elſewhere, and all Editions, but that at *Rome*, and others which follow it. So that this *Author* plainly aſſerts, that the *Subſtance* of the *Elements* does remain ſtill, and therefore can only be underſtood of a *Sacramental Change.*

Chryſoſt. in Act. hom. 23.

De Sacrament. l. 4 *c.* 4.

Thus I have, to ſatisfie you, examined your Teſtimonies in Behalf of *Tranſubſtantiation*; but whereas you referr me for more to *Bellarmine* and other *Catholick Authors*, I ſhall referr you for Anſwer to thoſe no leſs *Catholick Authors*, though no Believers of *Tranſubſtantiation*, who have taken large and excellent Pains in anſwering what they have brought, either from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. But you, having done your beſt in the latter, come at laſt to the former; but ſo pitifully manage your Buſineſs as to *Scripture*, that it had been more for the Intereſt of your Cauſe, you had never meddled with it. For you only ſay, *That the Words of Scripture, taken in their proper and literal Senſe, do evidently ſhew, that the only Subſtance which is delivered in this Sacrament, is the Body of Chriſt, and that the ſubſtance of Bread is no more there.* And all this comes only from hence, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, *This is my Body*, which you parallel with one, *pointing to a Hogſhead of Wine, ſaying, This is wine; and with one holding up a Purſe full of Money,*

Money, ſaying, This is Gold: who if they intend to ſpeak Truth, muſt ſignifie, that the only Liquor contained ſub propriâ formâ, *in the Hogſhead is Wine; and all the Money in the Purſe, Gold.* But how weak this is, will eaſily appear, 1. That you take it for granted, that the Expreſſion of Chriſt is not at all *Figurative*, but of the ſame *Nature* with thoſe Propoſitions you mention, whereas it is largely proved, from the Nature of a *Sacrament*, from many parallel *Expreſſions* in *Scripture*, from Evidence of *Antiquity*, *Senſe*, and *Reaſon*, that theſe Words of *Chriſt* cannot be otherwiſe than *figuratively* underſtood. 2. You ſuppoſe that *Chriſt* muſt ſpeak of the *individual Bread*, when he ſaid, *This is my Body*, as our parallel Inſtances are of ſuch *Individuals* as are pointed to. But *Bellarmine* will tell you, *That if Chriſt had ſpoken of the Bread, when he ſaid, This is my Body*, abſurdiſſima eſſet locutio, *it had been a moſt abſurd Speech.* And *Vaſquez* ſaith, *If the Pronoun* Hoc, *This, ſhould relate to the Bread, he confeſſes, that by virtue of thoſe Words, there could be no ſubſtantial Change made in it; for the Bread muſt remain ſtill.* So that by the Confeſſion of your own Authors, your Parallel is abſurd, and deſtructive to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Vaſquez. diſp. 180. *c.* 9. *n.* 91.

The third Error of a *General Council* confirmed by the *Pope* which his Lordſhip inſiſts on, is, *That of adminiſtring the B. Sacrament to the Laiety under one kind only.* Of this he had ſpoken before; and thither you referr us for your Anſwer; but I purpoſely omitted the handling it there, becauſe it comes in more properly in this Place. There his Lordſhip hath theſe Words: *To break Chriſt's Inſtitution is a damnable Error, and ſo confeſſed by* Stapleton. *The Council of* Conſtance *is bold, and defines peremptorily, that to communicate in both kinds is not neceſſary, with a* non-obſtante *to the Inſtitution of Chriſt; and although* Bellarmine *anſwers, that the* non-obſtante *only belongs to the time of receiving it after Supper*, yet his Lordſhip ſhews *from the Words of the Council, that the* non-obſtante *muſt relate to both Clauſes foregoing, and hath as much force againſt receiving under both kinds, as againſt receiving after Supper. Yea, and the after Words of the Council couple both together, in this Reference; for it follows*, & ſimiliter, *And ſo likewiſe, though in the Primitive Church*, &c. *And a Man by the Definition of this Council may be an Heretick for ſtanding to Chriſt's Inſtitution, in the very Matter of the Sacrament: And the Church's Law for one kind may not be refuſed, but Chriſt's Inſtitution under both kinds may. And yet this Council did not err; no, take heed of it.* But all this cannot perſwade you, *That the* non-obſtante *relates to any thing but to the receiving after Supper*: which I much wonder at, ſince the Deſign of the *Decree* of the Council was not to determine ſo much concerning the Time of receiving, as the Kinds in which it was to be received. Now to have ſaid point blank, that, notwithſtanding the *Inſtitution of Chriſt* to the contrary, they decreed that the *Sacrament* ſhould be received in one kind only, would have been too plain and groſs: and therefore they fetch it about with a compaſs, and put in ſomething not ſo much controverted then, the better to diſguiſe the Oppoſition between their *Decree* and *Chriſt's* Inſtitution. But yet by the adding the *Adminiſtration* in both Kinds to the time of receiving, and the *non-obſtante* following both, and the *Decree* being againſt that which is acknowledged to have been *done by Chriſt*, nothing can be more evident, than that the Senſe of the *Decree* implies a *non-obſtante* to *Chriſt's Inſtitution.* For otherwiſe, to what Purpoſe do they ſay, *Although*

§. 13.

P. 259.

P

Licet Chriſtus poſt cœnam inſtituerit, & ſuis diſcipulis adminiſtraverit ſub utraque ſpecie panis & vini, hoc venerabile Sacramentum; tamen, hoc non obſtante, *non confici debet poſt cœnam, nec recipi niſi à jejunis; ſimiliter, quod licèt in Primitivâ Eccleſiâ Sacramenta reciperentur ſub utraque ſpecie à fidelibus, tamen hæc conſuetudo, ut Laicis ſub ſpecie panis tantum ſuſcipiatur, habenda eſt pro lege, quam non licet reprobare: & aſſerere hanc eſſe illicitam, eſt erroneum, & pertinaciter aſſerentes ſunt arcendi tanquam hæretici.* Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ. 13.

Chriſt adminiſtred the Sacrament in both Kinds, and although the Primitive Church ſo received it, if they did not intend to decree ſomething contrary to that Adminiſtration and the Practice of the *Primitive Church*? Therefore, whether by the meer form of Words the *non-obſtante* doth relate to *Chriſt's Inſtitution* or no, is not material, ſince the *Decree* it ſelf is directly oppoſite to it. Although therefore *they did not put receiving in one kind immediately after the* non-obſtante (which is that you object) *as they do, not conſecrating after ſupper, and receiving faſting*, yet the Force of it reacheth to what follows after: as not only appears by the Connexion *And likewiſe*, but chiefly by the Scope of the Decree it ſelf. For the *Proctors* of the *Council*, *Henricus de Piro*, and *Johannes de Scribanis*, in their authentick *Inſtrument*, never exhibited any Controverſie at all concerning the *time* of *receiving*, but only concerning the *Communion* in *both kinds, becauſe, they ſaid, there was an ill Cuſtom* (ſo the obſerving *Chriſt's Inſtitution* was called) *for ſome Prieſts to give the Cup to the Laity, therefore they deſired the Council*, &c. So that it appears, this bringing in the *time* of *receiving* was only the *Artifice* of the Contrivers of the *Decree*, that they might with leſs Noiſe and Clamour thwart the plain *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*. And accordingly it appears by the Title of the Decree, that the Intent of it was to forbid the *giving the Sacrament to the People in both kinds*, and ſo *Caranza* delivereth the *Canon* it ſelf. *Præcipimus ſub pœnâ excommunicationis, quòd nullus presbyter communicet populum ſub utrâque ſpecie panis & vini.* Indeed, in the late *Editions* of the *Councils* by *Binius*, a Complaint is ſuppoſed to be made concerning the celebrating the *Sacrament* after *Supper* by ſome, which he ſeems to take out of *Cochlæus*, as appears by his *Notes*; but in the *Inſtrument* it ſelf nothing appears of that Nature: and ſince the *Decree* contains nothing againſt that Cuſtom as well as the other; it ſeems probable that this was made uſe of the better to bring on the other. But, whether it were ſo or no, is not very much material; for however the *Council* confeſſing that *Chriſt did ſo adminiſter it*, and that it was the *Cuſtom of the Primitive Church*, their prohibiting of it doth in its own Nature imply a *non-obſtante* to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*.

Caranz. Sum. Con. p. 415.

Concil. Tom. 7. *p.* 2 *p.* 1042.

§. 14. P. 271. But this is that you ſtiffly deny, *in ſaying, That neither the Decree of the Council nor the Practice of the Church in adminiſtring under one kind is contrary to the Inſtitution and Ordination of Chriſt. For*, ſay you, *to ſhew this, the Biſhop ſhould have made it appear that Chriſt did ſo inſtitute this Sacrament of his laſt Supper, that he would not have one part to be adminiſtred without the other, or that he would not have one part to be taken without the other. And it cannot be proved that Laymen are bound to receive in both kinds, from thoſe words, Drink ye all of this; For if this were a Command and not a Counſel, it was given to the Apoſtles who all drunk of the Chalice.* So that the State of the Queſtion is this, Whether the Primitive *Inſtitution* be univerſally obligatory to all *Chriſtians*, or no? For you ſuppoſe, that either it was only a *Counſel*, or elſe it had particular Reference to the *Apoſtles*. For the clearing therefore of this *Queſtion*, there are but two ways whereby we can judge of the obligatory Nature of ſuch *Inſtitution*; either by an expreſs Declaration of the Will of the firſt *Inſtitutor*, or by the *univerſal* Senſe of the *Church* concerning the Nature of that *Inſtitution*. And if theſe two appear evident in this preſent Caſe, you will have no cauſe to queſtion, but the *Communion in one kind is a Violation of the Inſtitution of Chriſt*. There are two Ways whereby we may judge what the Will of the *Legiſlator* is: Firſt, by an *expreſs poſitive Command*. Secondly, by an *unalterable Reaſon* on which the *Inſtitution* is founded. Now that both theſe are clear in the Caſe of Communion in both kinds I now come to manifeſt. Firſt, by a *poſitive* Command. For although we grant a Difference between

between an *Inſtitution* and a *Command*, in this reſpect, that the *Inſtitution* properly reſpects the *Thing*, and a *Command* the *Perſon*; and that an *Inſtitution*, barely conſidered as ſuch, doth not bind all Perſons to the *obſervance* of it; as we ſay, *Matrimony* is *Inſtituted* by *God*, but do not thence aſſert that all Perſons are *bound* to it, but yet take an *Inſtitution* as it refers to Perſons, and ſo it is æquipollent with a *Command*. And ſo *Chriſt's Inſtituting* that all who believe ſhould be *baptized*, is of the Nature of a *Command* to that Purpoſe. But here is a great Difference to be made between ſuch Things as were *done* at the *Inſtitution*, and ſuch Things as were *Inſtituted* to be *done* afterwards. Thus *Chriſt* waſhed his *Diſciples Feet*, adminiſtred *after Supper*, and only to *twelve*; but it doth not follow that theſe *Circumſtances* muſt be ſtill obſerved, becauſe though they were done then at that *Celebration*, yet *Chriſt* doth not *Inſtitute* or appoint the doing of them, when ever that *Sacrament* ſhould be adminiſtred afterwards. For we are to conſider, that though there were ſome things peculiar to the firſt *Inſtitution*, yet the main of it was intended for the *Church* in all following times. Or elſe we muſt make the Celebration of the *Euchariſt* it ſelf to be a meer Arbitrary thing. Which if it be not, there muſt lie an *Obligation* on Men for the *Participation* of it; Now this Obligation muſt ſuppoſe a *Law*, and therefore we have gained this, that the *Inſtitution* of the *Euchariſt* doth imply a Command for its Obſervation in the *Church*. So that this Action of *Chriſt* was not meerly a matter of *Counſel*, but there is ſomething in it perpetually *obligatory*: Becauſe it was not a peculiar *Rite* appropriated to the preſent time, but intended for the future Ages of the *Church*. This being proved in the *General*, that there is a perpetually obligatory *command*, implyed in the *Inſtitution*; we are now to enquire, How far this Command extends? Whether it extended only to the Apoſtles, or elſe to all Believers? That it was adminiſtred then to the Apoſtles only is granted, but the Queſtion is, In what Capacity it was adminiſtred to them, Whether only as *Apoſtles*, or as *Believers*? And that muſt be judged by the Intention of the *Inſtitution*, Whether it were of that Nature as to reſpect their *Apoſtolical Office*, or elſe ſome thing which would be common with them to all other Believers to the World's end? If it were only and wholly proper to the *Apoſtles*, there can be no reaſon given, why the *Inſtitution* of the *Sacrament* ſhould continue after their times: Neither could any other but the *Apoſtles* have any right, either to adminiſter or to receive it. It follows then, that this *Sacrament* was not inſtituted meerly for the *Apoſtles*; if not for them meerly, then what was contained in the *Inſtitution* doth concern others as well as them. Now there are four things commanded in the *Inſtitution*, *Take, eat, drink ye all of this, and, This do in remembrance of me.* If the *Inſtitution* doth not meerly reſpect the *Apoſtles* as ſuch but others alſo, then ſome of theſe things at leaſt muſt extend to others too conſidered as *Believers*. And if *ſome*, why not *all* of them? Were the *Apoſtles* conſidered as *Believers*, when they were bid *to take and eat*? And as *Apoſtles*, when *Chriſt* ſaid, *drink ye all of this*? What reaſonable Pretext can be imagined for ſuch a groundleſs Fancy? If they were not conſidered as *Believers*, when *Chriſt* ſaid *take, eat*; By what Right can any *Believers take* and *eat*? If they were then, ſo were they likewiſe afterwards, when *Chriſt ſaid to them, Drink ye all of this.* As far therefore as I can poſſibly ſee, you muſt either admit the People to *drinking all of this*, or elſe deprive them of their Right of *taking and eating*. And if you did ſpeak conſiſtently, you muſt ſay, that the Peoples being admitted at all to the *Euchariſt* is an Act of Favour and Indulgence in the *Church*, but not neceſſary by any Command of *Chriſt*, the *Euchariſt* being adminiſtred to the *Apoſtles* and

not the *People*; and therefore it being *Indulgence* to admit them at all, it is in the *Churches* Power to admit as far and to what ſhe pleaſes. This is the only rational way I can imagine, whereby you may defend the excluding the People from the *Cup*: But this you dare not ſay; and therefore are put to the weakeſt Shifts imaginable to reconcile it with the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*.

Some therefore ſay, *That all theſe are Words only of Invitation and not of Command, and that they only give a right, and not oblige men to do it.* But if theſe be only Words of *Invitation*, what *Precept* is there any where extant for the Celebration of the *Euchariſt*? That they are an *Invitation* we deny not; but we ſay they are ſuch an *Invitation* as imply a *Duty* to come too. When a *Father* bids his *Children* come and ſit down at *Table*, *take and eat* their Meat: This is an *Invitation*, but ſuch as by reaſon of the *Authority* of the Perſon carries a *Command* with it. So it is here, *Chriſt invites to come, to take, eat, and drink*; but ſo that it implies a *Command* that men ſhould come; or elſe it muſt be wholly left at Mens *Liberty*, ſo that it is no *Sin* for Men to neglect or refuſe to come. And if the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* only gives men a *Liberty* to *take, eat, and drink*, without any Obligation to theſe things as a *Duty*, How comes the Adminiſtration of the *Euchariſt* at all to become a *Duty*, ſince there are no other Words of command than what are contained in the *Inſtitution*? Which others being ſenſible of, they moſt unreaſonably diſtinguiſh between *taking and eating*, which they *make an abſolute command, and, Drinking all of this, which they ſay is only a conditional Precept*: and the Reaſon they give, is,

1 Cor. 11. 25. *becauſe S.* Paul *ſaith, This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me*; and ſo, ſay they, *Do this, doth not imply a Command for the doing it, but only the Relation which that Action hath to the Death of Chriſt when they do it; for thoſe Words; as oft as you do it, do ſuppoſe it not to be ſimply neceſſary, but only ſhew, when they do it, to what Purpoſe it ſhould be done.* But if there be any weight, in this, it will as well hold ſtill concerning the Participation of the *Bread*, as the *Cup*; for, as the *Apoſtle* ſaith *This do as oft as ye drink it in re-*

Ver. 26. *membrance of me*, ſo he adds in the Words immediately following, *For as often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do ſhew forth the Lord's Death till he come.* If therefore it notes only the Relation of the *Action* to its end without a *Command* for Performance in the *one*, it muſt do ſo in the *other* alſo. And ſo all the *Sacramant* will be a meer Matter of *Liberty* in the

De Euchariſt. l. 4. c. 25 *Church*, whether Men will obſerve it or no. But *Bellarmine* with wonderful Subtilty hath found a *Command* for the *one* and not the *other*; which

Luke 22. 19. is, *That in* Luke *after the Bread, Chriſt ſaith, This do in remembrance of me, but omits it wholly after the Cup; by which*, ſaith he, *we are to underſtand, that Chriſt commanded that the Sacrament ſhould be adminiſtred to all under the Species of Bread, but not under that of Wine.* And this he is ſo tranſported with, *That in a Rapture he admires the wonderful Providence of God in the Scripture, who by this Means hath taken away all poſſibility of Evaſion from the Hereticks.* So it ſhould ſeem indeed, when even his Brethren the *Jeſuits* can ſcarce hold laughing at this Subtilty. Since, *S. Paul* puts that Expreſſion, *This do in remembrance of me*, not after the *Bread*, but after the *Cup*. And therefore may we not more juſtly admire at the *Providence* of *God* in thus ſuffering Men who will not ſee the Truth under a Pretence of *Subtilty*,

Vaſquez. in 3. Thom. c. 2. diſput. 213. to *infatuate* themſelves. And although it be added here, *As oft as ye do it*, yet both *Vaſquez* and *Suarez* ingenuouſly confeſs, that contains under it a *Command* for the doing it. For, ſaith *Vaſquez*, *Qui præcipit ut opere aliquo commemoratio fiat alicujus beneficii accepti, ex modo ipſo præcipiendi præcipit etiam ut fiat opus ipſum. Quis hoc non videat?* *He that commands that by ſomething*

ſomething to be done a Commemoration ſhould be made of a Benefit received; from the manner of commanding it, he doth command that very Action to be done. Who doth not ſee this? And *Suarez* ſaith, *Thoſe Words, Do this, or with that Addition, In remembrance of me, or with that Condition, As oft as ye do it,* ad eundem ſenſum referuntur, *come all to the ſame purpoſe.* So that ſtill it follows, if there be a *Command* for one, there is for the other alſo. *Suarez. in 3. Tom. 3. diſp. 71. ſect. 2.*

But yet there is a *Subtilty* beyond any of theſe; which is, *That Chriſt in theſe Words in* Luke *after the Diſtribution of the Bread,* Hoc facite, *Do this, did make the Apoſtle's Prieſts; and therefore, although they did receive the Bread as Believers, yet they received the Cup as Prieſts, and ſo that belongs only to the Prieſts and not to the People.* What will not theſe Men prove which they have a mind to! But it is their Unhappineſs, that their own *Subtilties* do them the moſt Miſchief, as appears by theſe Things conſequent from hence; which are repugnant to their own Principles. 1. That *Prieſts* not conſecrating, ought to receive the Cup, as well as thoſe that do. For it is plain, that the *Apoſtles* did not conſecrate now, but only receive; and therefore this belongs to them as receiving, and not as conſecrating. And by the ſame Reaſons that *Prieſts* not conſecrating may receive, others may receive too. 2. That if they were made *Prieſts* by thoſe Words, after the Diſtribution of the Bread, then they have no Power to *conſecrate*, but only the *Bread.* For the Words are, *Hoc facite, Do this*, i. e. *that which Chriſt had then done.* Otherwiſe, if thoſe Words be taken with reference to the *Cup*, then if the *Apoſtles* received the Bread as *Believers*, they received the *Cup* ſo too; for theſe Words, *Do this*, muſt not relate to their *receiving*, but to their *Power* of *Conſecration.* 3. If this be taken generally, *Do this*, and ſo giving them a *Power* to do all that *Chriſt* did, then it will amount to a *Precept* for all who adminiſter to follow *Chriſt's Example* in the *Inſtitution.* And therefore, as he did adminiſter, the *Cup*, as well as the *Bread*, to all that were preſent, then all others will be bound to do ſo, if their Power of *Adminiſtration* be derived from theſe Words, *Do this*, and they refer to the whole Action of *Chriſt.* But I know what Anſwer will be here given, *That theſe Words relate to the Sacrifice, and not to the Sacrament,* Hoc facite, *implying their Power of ſacrificing, as to which they ſay, both Elements are neceſſary, but not to the Sacrament.* But 1. Not to enter on the Diſpute about the *Sacrifice*; if both *Elements* be neceſſary to it, then it was great Reaſon that the Words making them *Prieſts*, ſhould come after both *Elements*, and therefore it cannot in Reaſon be deduced from thoſe Words which are ſpoken only after the Bread. 2. If theſe Words relate to the *Sacrifice*, and not to the *Sacrament*, By what Authority do they adminiſter the *Sacrament*? What other Words are there to give them a Power to do the one diſtinct from them, whereby they pretend a *Right* for the other. 3. There is no Evidence at all from *Antiquity*, that *Hoc facite* hath any reſpect to the *Euchariſt* as a *Sacrifice*, or to the making the *Apoſtle's Prieſts.* And ſo much is confeſſed by *Eſtius*, viz. *that neither is this Expoſition found in any ancient Writer, nor is it ſuitable to our Saviour's purpoſe. For, he ſaith, it is not abſolutely ſaid* Facite, *but* Hoc facite, i. e. *that which ye ſee me do, do ye likewiſe.* So that ſtill, by virtue of theſe Words, thoſe who do receive Authority to adminiſter, are bound to follow *Chriſt's Example*, and that as he did adminiſter in *both Kinds* to all who were preſent, ſo ought they to do likewiſe. But there is one Exception yet more left, which is the laſt Reſerve, *viz. that although it be granted to be a Command, that the Cup ſhould be adminiſtred to all, yet it is only a poſitive Command, binding in the general; but yet it is of the Nature of all affirmative Precepts, that though it always binds, yet not at all times,* *Eſtius in l. 4. ſentent. diſt. 12. ſect. 11.*

times, but only in case of Necessity, of which Necessity the Church is the most competent Judge; and therefore if the Church do not think it necessary, then the Obligation ceases. To which I answer, 1. That upon this Ground it will be in the *Churches* Power to repeal or suspend all divine *positive Precepts* as well as this. For the Reason of this will hold for all others, which is, that they do not oblige, as they speak, *ad semper*, but only *semper*, i. e. *not at all times*, though they never *cease to oblige*. And therefore on this ground, for all that I can see, the *Church* may as well repeal the use of *Baptism*, or the *Eucharist* it self, as the *Communion in both Kinds*; all being of an equal Nature, as *affirmative Precepts*. But, Is it possible to imagine that *Christ* appointing *positive Institutions* in his *Church*, and giving *Precepts* and plain Directions about them, should yet leave it in the Power of any Men to reverse, alter, or suspend the *Obligation* to the Performance of those Commands? Did not he foresee all cases of *Necessity*, when he first appointed these Things, and, if notwithstanding that, he makes a plain Command, for the observance of them; What can such a pretended Power in the *Church* signifie, but an Authority to alter or repeal what she pleases in the *Laws* of *Christ*? 2. There is a great deal of Difference between the Nature of the *Obligation* of *affirmative Precepts*, and the prohibiting the *use* of something positively commanded. For, although *positive Precepts* do not bind at all Times, yet that reaches only to the thing it self, and not to the *Mod.* of Performance. Thus we say, That the *Eucharist* being a *positive Institution*, doth not oblige Men at all times to be Partakers of it; but if on that account any *Church* should undertake to forbid the Celebration of it, this were a direct Violation of the *Law* it self, and not an *Interpretation* of it in regard of Circumstances. And whatever Obligation of this Nature there is, it respects the whole *Duty*; But it doth by no means follow, that therefore in the *Celebration* the *Church* may declare what may be used, and what not. For the *manner* of *Performance* in case it be performed at all, is absolutely *commanded*; it is only the *Performance* in general, which is of the *Nature* of a *positive Precept*. Thus we say, Men are not *bound to pray at all Times*, though they be *always bound to pray*; but in case Men do pray, they are indispensably bound to pray as *God* hath required them to do it. So we say here, That Men are not *bound* at all times to administer, or receive the *Eucharist*; but, in case they do, they are indispensably bound to receive it according to *Christ's Institution*. So that this of *Communion* in *both Kinds*, relates to the *manner* of a *positive Precept*, and is not a distinct *positive Precept* by it self; and therefore is indispensable by any Authority of the *Church*. Besides, your *Church* doth nor meerly *suspend* the Exercise of this in case of Necessity, but forbids Men the doing it, which is a direct and wilful *Violation* of the *Institution* of *Christ*. And therefore the Question is not as it is strangely perverted by some of you, *Whether it be necessary at all Times to receive the Cup* (although even that be true in case of receiving at all) *but, whether it be in the Churches Power at all to prohibit the receiving it*; and this we say, and are ready to make good to be a Presumptuous Violation of the *Laws* of *Christ*, and an usurping an *Authority* which may as well extend to all positive *Institutions*. And thus I hope I have made that appear, which you say his Lordship should have done, viz. *that Christ did so institute the Sacrament of his last Supper, that he would not have one part to be administred without the other, nor one part to be taken without the other.*

§. 16. The same I might also at large shew, from the *Reasons* of this *Institution*, that they do equally belong to the People, as well as the *Priests*, and that those Reasons are of a Nature as unalterable as the *Institution* it self; where-

by

by I ſhould have ſhewed the Vanity of your Diſtinction of the *Euchariſt* into a *Sacrament*, and a *Sacrifice*, and the Abſurdity of your Doctrine of *Concomitancy*; but that would be too large for our preſent Deſign; and that which you give me not ſufficient ground to enter upon, ſince the Obligation is ſufficiently cleared from the *Inſtitution* it ſelf. I therefore proceed to ſhew, that the *Primitive Church* did always underſtand the *Communion* in both kinds to be an indiſpenſable part of the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*. Which one would think were evident enough from S. *Paul*, in his bringing the *Corinthians* back to the *Primitive Inſtitution*, as that unalterable Rule which they were to obſerve. For if, becauſe of ſome ill Cuſtoms which had obtained amongſt them, he tells them, *This is not to eat the Lord's Supper*; How much more would he have ſaid ſo, if there had been a *mutilation* of the *Parts* of it? And all along in his Diſcourſe he ſuppoſes *Chriſt's Inſtitution* to be the indiſpenſable Rule which they ought to obſerve; *That which I have received of the Lord, I delivered unto you*: not, certainly, to leave it in their Power: Whether they would obſerve it or no, but to ſhew them, what their Duty was, and what they ought unalterably to obſerve. Elſe he would never have told them ſo much of the danger of *unworthy receiving*, *in eating the Bread, and drinking the Cup of the Lord unworthily*; For, Can we poſſibly think, that the Rudeneſs of their acceſs to the *Lord's Table* was ſo great a Sin, and the Violation of his *Inſtitution* to be none at all? The *Apoſtles* were ſuch Strangers to the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, that ſtill both *eating and drinking* were ſuppoſed then, even by the moſt unworthy Receivers. There were then no ſuch *Fears* of the *Effuſion* of the *Blood of Chriſt*, or the Irreverence in receiving it, and much leſs of the *long Beards* of the *Laity*; which are the worſhipful Reaſons given by *Gerſon* and others, why the People ſhould not be admitted to the *uſe* of the *Chalice*. I do verily think the *Apoſtles* had as much care to preſerve the due Reverence of the *Sacrament*, as ever the *Councils* of *Conſtance* or *Trent* had; but they thought it no way to preſerve the Reverence of the *Sacrament*, by ſhewing ſo little to *Chriſt*, as not to obſerve his *Inſtitution*. But you very kindly grant that which you knew was impoſſible to be denied, *viz. That in ancient Times, when, you ſay, the Number of Chriſtians was ſmall, it was the ordinary Cuſtom for all that would (the Laity as well as others) to receive the Euchariſt in both kinds; but*, ſay you, *we averr, this Cuſtom proceeded meerly out of free Devotion, and not out of any Belief, that it was abſolutely neceſſary ſo to do, by virtue of Chriſt's Precept.* It is no great matter what you *averr*, ſince you *averr* ſo monſtrous a Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as confidently as you do this, and with much a like Reaſon. For I have ſhewed already, that the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* in reference to this, is perpetually Obligatory, and that the *Apoſtles* look upon that as an *unalterable Rule*, and therefore your *averring* ſignifies nothing, when you never offer to prove what you averr. But, I pray tell me, By what *means* would you underſtand what *Precepts* are perpetually obligatory, which are not clear to our preſent purpoſe? If *poſitive Command*, *immutable Reaſon*, *univerſal Practice* of the *Church* may prove any thing ſo, we have all theſe plain and clear for Communion in both kinds. And not the leaſt Suſpition or Intimation given, that they looked on it as a matter of *free Devotion*, but of *indiſpenſable Neceſſity*. But, What mean you in ſaying, *When the number of Chriſtians was ſmall, they received it in both kinds*? Do *Chriſt's Inſtitutions* vary according to the Numbers of *Communicants*? Hath not *Chriſt* the ſame Power to oblige *many* as a *few*? or, Do you think the Numbers of breakers of his *Inſtitution* make the Fault the leſs? But, When was it the number of *Chriſtians* was ſo ſmall? Only in the *Apoſtles* times, or as long as

2 Cor. 11. 20.

P. 293.

the

the Cuſtom laſted of *communicating* in both Kinds? Do you think the number of *Chriſtians* was ſo ſmall in the *Primitive Times*? If you do, you lamentably diſcover your Ignorance in the *Hiſtory* of thoſe Times: Read the *Chriſtian Apologies* over, and you will believe the contrary. But, Did this ſmall number continue in the time of the *Chriſtian Emperors*, even till after a *Thouſand Years* after Chriſt? For ſo long the Communion in both Kinds continued ſo inviolably, that neither you, nor any before you, are able to produce one *Inſtance* of a publick and ſolemn Celebration of the *Euchariſt* in the *Church* wherein the *People* did not communicate in both Kinds. And, Could a matter ſo indifferent as you ſuppoſe this to be, meet with no Perſons all this time, who out of Reverence to the *Blood of Chriſt*, ſhould deny giving it to the *People*? Nothing then but an unmeaſurable Confidence, and a Reſolution to ſay any thing, though never ſo falſe or abſurd (if it tend to the Intereſt of your *Church*) could make you ſay, *That Communion in one kind was always, even in the firſt five or ſix hundred Years, allowed publickly as well in the Church, as out of it.* Than which, if you had ſtudied it, you could ſcarce have uttered a *greater untruth*; and in which there are ſuch *Multitudes* of your own Party bearing Witneſs againſt you. And *Bellarmin* is ſo far from helping you out in it, that he is extremely at a Loſs to offer at any thing which hath any Tendency that way. But before we come to conſider the Inſtances and Exceptions you make, we muſt ſomewhat further ſee, what the Practice and Senſe of the *Church* was, that we may the better judge, Whether Communion in both *Kinds* were looked on as a matter only of *free Devotion*, or as ſomething neceſſary by virtue of *Chriſt's Inſtitution*. And for this I ſhall not inſiſt on thoſe Multitudes of Teſtimonies, which manifeſt the Practice it ſelf, but briefly touch at ſome few, which more directly prove, that what they did, was, Becauſe in doing otherwiſe, they ſhould have violated the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt. To paſs by therefore the Teſtimonies of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, all clear for the Practice; the firſt I inſiſt on, is that of S. *Cyprian* againſt thoſe who gave Water in the *Chalice*, inſtead of Wine; for, whoſoever doth but read the very Entrance of that Epiſtle, will ſoon find that he looked on *Chriſt's Inſtitution* in all the parts of it as *unalterable*. *For* (ſaith he) *although I know, that moſt Biſhops do keep to that which agrees with the truth of the Goſpel, and what our Lord hath delivered; and do not depart from that which Chriſt our Maſter hath commanded and practiſed: yet becauſe ſome, either through Ignorance, or Simplicity, in ſanctifying the Cup of our Lord, and delivering it to the People, do not that which Jeſus Chriſt our Lord and God, the Author and Teacher of this Sacrifice, did and taught; I have thought it a neceſſary part of my Duty to write to you, that if any one continue in that Error, he may, by diſcovering the Light of Truth, return to the Root and Fountain of our Lord's Tradition.* I inſiſt on this Teſtimony, not only for the clearneſs of it, as to the Cuſtom of giving the *Cup* to the People; but eſpecially for the Evidence contained in it, of the unalterable Nature of the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt. For that he looks on as the great Fault of them who miniſtred *Water* inſtead of *Wine*, that they therein departed from the Example and Precept of *Chriſt*. Now there cannot be produced any greater Evidence of any Obligation as to this, than there is as to the giving the *Cup* it ſelf. For here is *Chriſt's Example* and *Inſtitution* equally as to both of them, and that in the ſame Words, *Drink ye all of it.* If that were ſuch a departing from the *Inſti-*

tution

Quanquam ſciam Epiſcopos plurimos, Evangelicæ veritatis ac Dominicæ traditionis tenere rationem, nec ab eo quod Chriſtus Magiſter & præcepit & geſſit, humanâ & novellâ inſtitutione decedere; tamen quoniam quidam vel ignoranter vel ſimpliciter in calice Dominico ſanctificando, & plebi miniſtrando, non hoc faciant quod Jeſus Chriſtus, Dominus & Deus noſter, ſacrificii hujus Auctor & Doctor, fecit & docuit; religioſum pariter ac neceſſarium duxi, has ad vos literas facere, ut ſi quis in iſto errore adhuc teneatur, veritatis luce perſpectâ ad radicem atq; originem traditionis Dominicæ revertatur. Cyprian. Epiſt. 63.

tion to alter the *Liquor*, would it not have been accounted as great, to take away the *Cup* wholly? For afterwards he adds, *If Men ought not to break the leaſt of Chriſt's Commands, How much leſs thoſe great ones which pertain to the Sacrament of our Lord's Paſſion, and our Redemption? Or to change it into any thing, but that which was appointed by him?* And if not to change the matter, certainly neither can it be lawful to order the *Adminiſtration* otherwiſe than *Chriſt* appointed. I know *Bellarmine* ſaith, *The Parity of Reaſon will not hold, becauſe this is to corrupt the matter of the Sacrament:* but S. *Cyprian* doth not inſiſt on that as his Reaſon, but the departing from the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and this is done by one as well as the other. But he adds, *That there was a Precept for that, Do this.* And ſo ſay we, was there as plain for the other, *Drink ye all of this.* So that the Parity of Reaſon is evident for the one as well as the other. Upon the ſame ground doth *Pope Julius* afterwards condemn the uſing *Milk* inſtead of *Wine*, becauſe contrary to *Chriſt's Inſtitution*; and ſo he doth the *dipping the Bread in the Chalice:* From whence we infer, that they looked on *Chriſt's Example* and *Inſtitution* in the Adminiſtration to be *unalterable*. But moſt expreſs is the Teſtimony of *Pope Gelaſius*, who finding ſome, from the Remainders of *Manichaiſm*, did abſtain from the *Cup*, gives expreſs order, *That they who were infected with this odd Superſtition, either ſhould receive the whole Sacrament, or abſtain wholly from it; becauſe the dividing one and the ſame Myſtery, cannot be done without great Sacrilege.* To this, *Bellarmine* tells us, two Anſwers are commonly given; one, *That theſe words are meant of Prieſts*; another, *That they relate only to thoſe ſuperſtitious Perſons*; but both of them are ſufficiently taken off by the Reaſon aſſigned, which is not fetched either from their *Preiſthood*, or *Superſtition*, but only from the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, that it would be *Sacrilege* to part thoſe things, which *Chriſt* by his *Inſtitution* had joined together. Thus we ſee, the Senſe of the *Church* is clear, not only for the *Practice*, but the *Command* too; and the ſinfulneſs of the *Violation* of it. Although to you one would think it were wholly needleſs to prove any more than the *Univerſal Practice*, ſince the *Tradition* of the *Church* is equal with you, with an *unwritten Word*; but that is, when it makes for your purpoſe, and not otherwiſe. For in this caſe, though the *Inſtitution* be expreſs, the univerſal *Practice* of the *Church* for at leaſt a Thouſand Years unqueſtionable; yet becauſe it contradicts the preſent Senſe and Practice of your *Church*, all this ſignifies nothing at all with you. So true is it, that it is neither *Scripture* nor *Antiquity*, which you really regard, but *Intereſt* and the *Preſent Church*. And what *Cuſanus*, like a downright Man, ſpake out in this caſe, is that you muſt all at laſt take ſanctuary in, *That the Scriptures muſt be interpreted according to the current Practice of the Church*; and therefore *it is no wonder if they be interpreted at one time one way, and another time another way.* And though this ſeem a very great Abſurdity, yet it is no more than is neceſſary to be ſaid by ſuch who maintain things ſo contrary to *Scripture*, and the Practice of former Ages of the *Church*.

De Euchar. l. 4 c. 25.

Comperimus quod quidam, ſumptâ tantummodo corporis ſacri portione, à calice ſacri cruoris abſtineant: Qui proculdubio (quoniam neſcio-quâ ſuperſtitione docentur obſtringi) aut Sacramenta integra percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia diviſio unius & ejuſdem myſterii ſine grandi ſacrilegio non poteſt provenire. Apud Gratian. Comper. de Conſecr. diſt. 2.

Cuſan. ep. 27.

But you are ſo far from thinking this contrary to the *Practice* of the *Church* in former Ages, that you ſay, *Not only in S.* Thomas *his Time, but in all Times of the Church, it was both publickly allowed, and commonly by ſome practiſed even in Churches, to receive under one kind only.* A bold Aſſertion, and which is confidently denied by very many of your own Communion. For not only *Caſſander* often confeſſes, that for above a Thou-

§. 17. P. 289. *Caſſander de Commun. ſub utrâq; p. 1025, 1027, 1039. op. Pariſ.*

ſand Years after Chriſt, no inſtance can be produced of publick Communion in one kind: But *Father Barns* acknowledges not only that *Communion* in both *Kinds*, is much more agreeable to *Scripture*, *Fathers*, and the *Univerſal Church*, but that *per ſe loquendo jure divino præſcribitur*, taking it in it ſelf, it is commanded by a *Divine Law*. But I know theſe Men are too honeſt for you to own them, but as to the univerſal Practice of the *Church* it is confeſſed by *Ruardus*, *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, *Lindanus*, and many others. But we need no more than your *S. Thomas* himſelf, even in that very place, where you ſay, *He rather makes for you, than againſt you*; for, when he ſays, that *Provide in quibuſdam Eccleſiis obſervatur ut populo ſanguis non detur*, *It was a Cuſtom providently obſerved in ſome Churches, not to give the Sacrament in the Form of Wine to the Laity*; He thereby ſhews indeed, that in his time about *A. D.* 1260. this cuſtom did in ſome Places obtain, but yet ſo, that the *univerſal Practice* had been to the contrary; for ſo much is confeſſed by him in his Commentaries on *S. John*, where his Words are, *ſecundum antiquam in Eccleſiâ conſuetudinem omnes ſicut communicabant corpori, ita communicabant & ſanguini, quod etiam adhuc in quibuſdam Eccleſiis ſervatur. According to the ancient Cuſtom of the Church, all did communicate in both kinds, which as yet is obſerved in ſome Churches.* Now, Whether the Univerſal Practice of the Church in former times, or the Practice of ſome Churches in his time, were more agreeable to the *Divine Inſtitution*, we may appeal to *Aquinas* himſelf, who elſewhere gives this Account, Why the Elements of Bread and Wine, were made uſe of, and delivered ſeverally, *That they might denote a complete Refection, and fully repreſent the Death and Paſſion of our Saviour.* On the ſame Accounts *Bonaventure* and *Alenſis* make both Kinds neceſſary to the *Integrity* of the *Sacrament*. And the latter (who was *Maſter* to the two former) ſays expreſly, *That whole Chriſt is not contained Sacramentally under either kinds; but his Fleſh under that of Bread, and his Blood under that of Wine.* Than which nothing can be more deſtructive to the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*. And it is learnedly proved by *Pet. Picherellus*, that the *Bread* was appointed to repreſent not the *Body* in its compleat *Subſtance*, but the meer *Fleſh*, when the *Blood* is out of it, according to the Diviſion of the *Sacrifices* into *Fleſh* and *Blood*; from whence it appears, that the *Sacrifice* of Chriſt's Death cannot be repreſented meerly by *one* kind, and that whole *Chriſt* is not contained under *one*, in the Adminiſtration of it. And therefore *Alenſis* rightly determines, that the *res Sacramenti* cannot be *perfectly* repreſented by one kind; and thence ſays, *He that receives but in one kind, doth not receive the Sacrament perfectly.* No wonder therefore that he tells us, *That ſome religious Perſons in his time* (when the contrary Cuſtom, through the Superſtition of People, had ſomewhat prevailed) *did earneſtly deſire that the Sacrament might again be received in both Kinds.* Thus we ſee, when this Cuſtom did begin, Reaſon and Argument was ſtill againſt it, and nothing pleaded for it, but only ſome ſuperſtitious Fears of ſome *accidental Effuſions* of the *Blood of Chriſt*. But you are the Man, who would ſtill perſwade us, *That Communion in one kind was not only publickly allowed, but by ſome practiſed even in Churches in all Times of the Church.* And therefore in Reaſon we muſt give Attendance to your impregnable Demonſtrations of it. For otherwiſe, ſay you, *How is it poſſible that the Manichees ſhould find Liberty and Opportunity to communicate amongſt Catholicks in Catholick Churches, without being perceived, ſince they never drank Wine, nor communicated under the Form of Wine? as 'tis certain they frequently did in S. Leo's time, and after.* But you have very unhappily light of this for your firſt Proof, which is ſo evident againſt you. For *Leo*, who mentions the *Manichees* communicating in *Chatholick Churches*,

Barns Catholicco-Rom. Pariſ. ſect. 7. lit. 8.

Ruard. Tapper. Tom. 2. p. 328. Alphonſ. à Caſtro. hæreſ. 38. Lindan. Panop. l. 4. c. 56.

Aquinas p. 3, qu. 80. Art. 12.

Aquinas, c. Gentes, l. 4. cap. 61. Bonavent, l. 4. diſt. 8. Art. 2. q. 2. Alenſis, p. 4. q. 6. memb. 3. Art. 2.

P. Picherel. de Miſſâ. c. 4.

Alenſ. p. 4. q. 31. memb. 1.

Alenſ. p. 4. q. 53. memb. 1.

Churches, tells the *Catholicks*, What way they might discern them from themselves, viz. *that though they received the Bread, yet they refused the Wine; by which*, saith he, *you may discover their Sacrilegious Hypocrisie, and by that Means they may be expelled out of the Society of Catholicks.* You were therefore very ill advised, to make choice of this for your Argument, which makes it plain, that all *Catholicks* did receive in *both Kinds*, and that the *Manichees* might be thereby known that they did not. And if it were the Custom for the *Catholicks* sometimes to receive in both Kinds, and sometimes not, (which is all the shift *Bellarmine* hath) and the *Manichees* not at all, this could be no note of *Distinction* between them; for, although the *Manichees* might not receive at one time, they could not tell but they might at another. Now *Leo*'s Intention being, to give such a Note of Distinction, that they might not receive at all among them, it evidently follows, that all the *Catholicks* did constantly receive in both Kinds, and that they were only *Manichees* who did abstain from the *Cup*. For that Story which *Bellarmine* insists on, and you refer to, *of the Woman, who being a Macedonian Heretick, yet pretending to communicate with the Catholicks, had the Bread which her Maid brought with her, and which she took instead of the Eucharist, turned into a Stone in her Mouth, upon which she runs presently to the Bishop, and with Tears confessed her Fault*; as we take it wholly upon the Faith of *Sozomen*, from whom *Nicephorus* transcribes it, so I cannot imagine what it proves for your purpose, unless it be, that they in whose *Mouths* the *Bread* turns into a *Stone* too, will hardly have Patience till the *Cup* be administred to them. For so both *Sozomen* and *Nicephorus* relate it, that immediately upon her feeling it to be a *Stone*, she ran to the *Bishop*, and shewed him the *Stone*, acknowledging with Tears her Miscarriage. But besides this, you bring several *Instances* from the Communion of *Hermits in the Wilderness*, *of Travellers on their Journeys*, *of sick Persons in their Beds*, *and private Communions in Houses*, *and lastly*, *little Children in the Church*, *and at Home in their Cradles*, *which communicated in Form of Wine only*. And, Are not all these invincible Proofs, that there was a publick, solemn Administration of the Communion in one kind publickly allowed in *Churches* in all times? When you can prove that the *Communion* of *Hermits* was in the *Church*, or that they did not receive as well the *Wine* as the *Bread* in the *Wilderness*, or that such Communion was approved by the *Church*: That the *Communion* of *Travellers* was not *meer Communion in Prayers*, as *Baronius* and *Albaspinæus* assert, without any Participation of the *Eucharist* at all; or if it were, that it was only a *Participation* in *one kind* (against which *Albaspinæus* gives many Reasons:) That the *Communion of the Sick* was without *Wine*, when *Justin Martyr* saith, *That both Bread and Wine were sent to the absent*: when *Eusebius* tells us, That the *Bread* given to *Serapion*, was *dipt*; when S. *Hierome* saith of *Exuperius*, That he preserved the *Blood in a Glass for the use of the Sick*: That *Private Communions* were without *Wine*, since *Gregory Nazianzen* saith, his Sister *Gorgonia*, *preserved both the Symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ*; and *Albaspinæus* confesses, that one might be carried Home as well as the other: or that these were approved by the *Church*, since *Durantus* saith, *That the use of private Communions coming up by Persecutions, were abrogated afterwards*; and are expresly condemned by the *Council* of *Cæsar-Augusta* about the Year 381. and the first Council of *Toledo*, about *A. D.* 400. Lastly, that the *Communion of Infants* was only *in one kind*, either in the *Church* or at Home,

Quum ad tegendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, tam sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujusmodi homines & hisce manifestentur indiciis, & quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati & proditi e sanctorum societate, sacerdotum auctoritate pellantur. Leo. Sermon. quadragesf. 4.

Sozom. hist. l. 8. c. 5. Niceph. l. 13. c. 7.

Baron. An. 400. n. 67. Albaspinæ. observat. l. 1. c. 3. Justin. Martyr. Apol. 2. Euseb. hist. l. 6. c. 36. Hieron. ep. 4. Nazianz. Or. 11. Albaspinæ. obs. cap. 4. l. 1. Durant. de ritib. Eccles. l. 2. c. 55.

Home, or that this *Communion of Infants* which the *Council* of *Trent* condemns, was a *due Administration* of the *Eucharist:* When I say you have proved all these Things, the utmost you can hence infer, is, only that in some rare Cases, and accidental Occasions, *Communion in one kind* was allowed of. But what is all this to the proving that the *stated, solemn Administration* of the *Eucharist in one kind* was ever practised, much less allowed, within a thousand Years after Christ. And yet if you could prove that, you fall short of vindicating your *Church*, unless you add this, which you never so much as touch at, *viz.* That it was ever in all that time thought lawful to forbid the Celebration of the *Eucharist* in both *Kinds.* Prove but this, which is your only proper Task, and I say as his Lordship doth in another case, *You shall be my Apollo for ever.*

§. 18. P. 276. We proceed to a fourth Error, which is the *Invocation of Saints* defined by the *Council* of *Trent.* As to which, that which his Lordship saith may be reduced to three Things. 1. *That those Expressions of the Fathers which seem most to countenance it are but Rhetorical Flourishes.* 2. *That the Church then did not admit of the Invocation of Saints, but only of the Commemoration of Martyrs.* 3. *That the Doctrine of the Roman Church makes the Saints more than Mediators of Intercession.* To these three I shall confine my Discourse on this Subject, and therefore shall follow you close in your Answers to them. For the first, When you are proving that the *Fathers* Expressions were not *Rhetorical Flourishes*, you would fain have P. 292. your own accounted so. *For*, say you, *How can it seem to any that duly considers it, but most extreamly partial and strange to term so many Exhortations, so many plain and positive Assertions, so many Instances, Examples, Histories, Reports and the like, which the Fathers frequently use, and afford in this kind (and that upon Occasions wherein dogmatical and plain Delivery of Christian Doctrine and (truth is expected) nothing but Flourishes of Wit and Rhetorick?* And after, you call these *meer Put offs*, as before you had said, *That when any thing in the Fathers is against us, then it is Rhetorick only; when against you, then it is dogmatical and the real Sense of the Fathers.* But these are only General Words, fit only to deceive such who believe bold Affirmations sooner than solid Proofs. This is a thing must be tried by Particulars, because it is on both Sides acknowledged, that the *Fathers* did many times use their *Rhetorick*, and that *De Missâ, l. 2. c. 10.* such Things are uttered by them, in their *Panegyrical Orations* especially, *Sixtus Sen. bibl. Annot. 152. l. 6.* which will not abide a severe Trial. Doth not *Bellarmine* confess that St. *Chrysostome* doth often *hyperbolize*, and *Sixtus Senensis* say as much of others, that *Basil. ep. 64.* in the heat of their Discourses they are carried beyond what they would have *Theodoret. dialog. 3.* said in a strict Debate? But who are better Judges of these Things than the *Fathers* themselves? Are not they the Men, who have bid us distinguish what comes from them in a Heat, from that which they deliver as the Doctrine of the *Church*? Have not they told us, that the popular *Orations* uttered in *Churches* are no Rules of Opinion? Have not some of them, when they have seemed extream vehement and earnest, at last come off with this, *That they have been declaiming all that while?* Witness S. *Hierom* against *Helvidius*; and if you make not use of the same Rule to put a favourable Construction on his Books against *Jovinian*, *Vigilantius*, *Ruffinus* and others, you will as little be able to excuse him from strange Doctrines, as from intemperate Heats. What *put-off* then is it for us to say, that S. *Basil* in his *Oration* on *Mammas*, and the forty eight *Martyrs*; that S. *Gregory Nazianzen* in his *Panegyrical Orations* on S. *Basil*, S. *Athanasius*, S. *Cyprian*, his Sister *Gorgonia*, S. *Gregory Nyssen* in his Commendation of *Theodorus*, do make use of their *Rhetorick* in *Apostrophe's* to the Persons whom they praise,

Praiſe, without any ſolemn Invocation of them? What is there herein unſuitable to their preſent Purpoſe? Is it any more than *Orators* have commonly done? What ſtrange thing is it then, that thoſe great *Maſters* of *Rhetorick* ſhould make uſe of their Art to raiſe the People, not only to a high Eſteem of their Perſons, but of thoſe Vertues which rendred them ſo Illuſtrious? Might not ſuch Expreſſions by way of *Apoſtrophe* be ſtill uſed by ſuch who are furtheſt from the *Invocation* of *Saints*? Although by their Example we are taught how dangerous it is to indulge *Rhetorick* too much in ſuch Caſes. But as though they foreſaw the ill Uſe would be made of them, they add ſuch Expreſſions as ſufficiently tell us, they made no ſolemn Invocation of them; εἴ τις αἴσθησις, ὡς οἶμαι, and the like. Had theſe Perſons a mind to deliver a Doctrine of *Invocation* of *Saints*, who ſpeak with ſuch *Heſitation* and doubt as to their Senſe of what was ſpoken? (For, it is a groundleſs ſhift, to ſay, that thoſe Expreſſions imply an Affirmation and not Doubt.) That which we ſay then, is this, That the Doctrine of the *Church* is not to be judged by ſuch *Encomiaſtick Orations*, wherein ſuch *Rhetorical Flouriſhes* are uſual; and when you bring us their plain and poſitive Aſſertions, we will by no means give you that Anſwer, That thoſe are *Flouriſhes of Wit and Rhetorick*. But his Lordſhip very well knew how far you were from any ſuch dogmatical Aſſertions of the *Fathers* in this Point, and that the moſt plauſible Teſtimonies which you had were taken out of thoſe three great *Orators* in their *Panegyricks* in praiſe of their Friends, or of the *Martyrs*; and therefore it was he ſaid, *Though ſome of the ancient Fathers have ſome Rhetorical Flouriſhes about it, for the ſtirring up Devotion (as they thought) yet the Church then admitted not of the Invocation of Saints.* That is it we ſtand on, that no ſuch things was admitted by the *Church*, if we ſhould yield that any particular (though great) Perſons were too laviſh in their Expreſſions this way; muſt theſe be the Standard which we muſt judge of the Doctrine of the *Church* by? We muſt conſider the *Church* was now out of Perſecution, and Eaſe and Honour attended that Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, for which ſuch Multitudes had endured the Flames; and the People began to grow more looſe and vain than when they ſtill expected *Martyrdoms*: This made theſe great Men ſo highly commend the *Martyrs* in their popular Orations, not to propound them as *Objects* of *Invocation*, but as *Examples* for their *Imitation*. Thence they encouraged them to frequent the *Memoriæ Martyrum*, that by their Aſſemblies in thoſe Places they might revive ſomething of that priſtine Heat of Devotion, which was now ſo much abated among them. But the Event was ſo far from anſwering their Expectation, that by this Means they grew by degrees to place much of their Religion, rather in honouring the former *Martyrs* and *Saints*, than in ſtriving to imitate them in their Vertues and Graces. And from the frequenting the Places where the *Martyrs* were enſhrined through the pretence of ſome ecſtatical Dreams and Viſions, or ſome rare Occurrencess which they ſay happened at thoſe Places, they began to turn their real Honour into ſuperſtitious Devotion, which at laſt ended in ſolemn *Invocation*. To which no ſmall Encouragement was given when ſuch Perſons as S. *Hierom* and others, were ſo far from putting a ſtop to the growing Evil, that though they confeſſed many Miſcarriages committed, yet they rather ſought to palliate them and make the beſt Conſtruction of them, ſtill hoping that this Zeal in the People to the Honour of the *Martyrs* would promote Devotion among them; whereas it ſunk gradually into greater Superſtitions. This I take to be the trueſt and moſt faithful Account of thoſe firſt Beginnings and Tendencies to *Invocanion* of *Saints*, which appeared in the latter end of the fourth *Century*.

For

§. 19. For before that time we meet with nothing that can bear the Face of any *positive* and *plain Assertions*, *Instances*, *Examples*, *Histories*, *or Reports tending that way*. Which is so clear, that *Cardinal Perron* after the best use of his Wit and Diligence to find out something to this Purpose within the three first *Centuries*, at last confesses, that in the Authors who lived nearer the *Apostles* times no Footsteps can be found of the *Invocation* of *Saints*. But when he gives this account of it, *That most of the Writings of that time are lost*, it makes us see what poor Excuses bad Causes will drive the greatest Wits to. For are not the Writings of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius* and others still extant, who were pious and learned men? And is it possible that such men should all of them conceal such a Doctrine as this, which would so easily appear in the Face of the *Church*? But it is well we have the Confession of so great a Man for the best Ages of the *Church*; and not only so, but he acknowledges withal, *That there is neither Precept nor Example for it in the Scripture*. Which others not only assert, but offer to give Reasons for it, for the Old Testament: *Because the Fathers were not then admitted to the beatifical Vision*: and for the New Testament, *Because the Apostles were men of such Piety and Humility, that they would not admit of it themselves, and therefore made no mention of it in their Writings; and withal, Because in the beginning of Christianity there would have been a Suspicion, that they had only changed the Names of Heathen Deities, and retained the same kinds of Worship*. These for the new Testament we admit of, not as *Rhetorical Flourishes*, but as *plain and positive Assertions* which contain a great deal of Truth and Reason in them. So that here is a confessed Silence as to this Doctrine throughout all the Story of *Scripture*, and for 300 Years and more after Christ; and in all this time we meet with no such *assertions*, *instances*, *examples*, *reports*, and the like, which tend to establish this new Doctrine. But instead of this, we meet with very *plain Assertions* to the contrary, back'd with strong and invincible Reasons; and herein not to insist on those Places in *Scripture* which appropriate *Invocation* to *God* only, and that in regard of his incommunicable Attributes of *omniscience*, and *infinite Goodness* and *Power*, Which are the only Foundations given in *Scripture* for *Invocation*: not to mention those Places, where all Tendencies to such kind of *Worship* of any created Being, are severely checked; and wherein an *Inferior* and relative *Worship* is condemned on this Account, Because *all Worship is due to God only*; and wherein that very Pretence of *Humility*, in not coming to *God*, but through some Mediator is expresly spoken against; nor to inlarge how much this Doctrine of *Invocation* of *Saints* is injurious to *God*, by giving that *Worship* to Creatures which belongs only to himself, and how repugnant it is to *Divine Worship*, that Prayers should be made to *Saints* for them to interceed with *God*, when they cannot know what those Prayers are till *God* reveals them; nor how dishonourable it is to *Christ*, both in regard of his *Merits* and *Intercession*; nor how great a Check it is to true *Piety* to put men to pray to them, whom they can have no ground to believe do hear or regard their Prayers, and in the mean time to take them off from their serious and solemn Addresses to *God*. Not to insist, I say, on these Things, because I design no set Discourse on this Subject, which hath been so amply handled by so many already; I shall only discover the Sense of the *Primitive Church* in this particular by two things, the one of which takes in the first three Centuries, and the other extends a great deal further: From which I doubt not, but to make it evident how far the *Invocation* of *Saints* was from being received then. The first is, from the Answers given to the *Heathens*, when it was objected against the *Christians* that they did worship dead Men and Angels. I confess,

Eckius in Enchirid. cap. 5. Salmeron. in 1 Tim. 2. disp. 8. Peres. de Tradit. p. 3.

confeſs, ſome have been ſo ſubtle as from hence to infer, *that they did it*; or elſe, ſay they, the *Heathens* would never have charged them with it. But they who read the *Chriſtians Apologies* will find far more unreaſonable things than this laid to their charge, and I hope they will not ſay, there muſt be an equal ground for all the other Imputations alſo. But it ſeems they more believe the *Heathens Objections* than the *Chriſtians* Anſwers, who utterly diſavow any ſuch thing. The firſt mention we find of any ſuch Imputation, is in that excellent Epiſtle of the *Church* of *Smyrna* to the *Church* of *Philomylium* concerning the Martyrdom of *Polycarp*, wherein they tell us; how ſome ſuggeſted to *Nicetas*, that he ſhould deſire the *Proconſul* that *Polycarp*'s Body might not be granted to the *Chriſtians*; *Leſt*, ſay they, *they ſhould leave to worſhip Him that was Crucify, and worſhip him*; to which they return this excellent Anſwer. *They are ignorant that we can never be induced to forſake Chriſt, who ſuffered for the Salvation of all who ſhall be ſaved of the whole World, or to worſhip any other for him being the Son of God we adore. But the Martyrs as the Diſciples and Followers of the Lord, we love worthily for their exceeding great Affection toward their own King and Maſter, of whom we wiſh that we may be Partners and Diſciples.* Can any thing be more expreſs than this is, to ſhew what Difference they put between Chriſt and the *Martyrs*? Not that they worſhipped one as *God* with an *abſolute direct Worſhip*, and the other as *ſubordinate Interceſſors*, with *a relative and indirect Worſhip*, as you would have told them; but they *worſhiped Chriſt and none but him*, becauſe he was the *Son of God*; but for the *Martyrs*, they *loved* them indeed, but they worſhiped them not at all, for ſo much is implyed in the *Antitheſis* between that and their Worſhip of *Chriſt*. So that theſe Words are excluſive of any kind of Worſhip which they gave to the *Martyrs*; for they were ſo far from giving them that *Worſhip* which belonged to the *Son* of *God*, that they only expreſſed their *Love* to them, without giving them any *Worſhip*. And in the old Latin Tranſlation of this Epiſtle, of which there are two *MSS.* extant in *England*; when they ſay, *They can worſhip none elſe but Chriſt*, it is there rendred, *Neque alteri cuiquam precem orationis impendere, Nor impart the Supplication of Prayer to any other.* As the late learned *Lord Primate Uſher* hath obſerved; which utterly deſtroys the Doctrine of *Invocation*.

Bellarm. de Sanct. Beatit. l. 1. c. 13.

Ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι οὔτε τὸν Χριστὸν ποτὲ καταλιπεῖν δυνησόμεθα, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίαν παθόντα, ὅτε ἑτέρου τινὰ σέβειν. τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ ὑιὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν. τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας, ὡς μαθητὰς τε καὶ μιμητὰς, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι. Apud Euſeb. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 4. c. 15. ed. Valeſ.

Anſwer to the Jeſuits Chall. *p.* 426. *q.* 20.

We proceed further to ſee what Account *Origen* gives of the *Chriſtian Doctrine* touching *Invocation* in his Anſwer to *Celſus*, wherein he had ſufficient Occaſion given him to declare the Senſe of the Church at that time. And if he had known or approved any *relative Worſhip* given to *Angels* or *Saints*, it is not conceivable that he ſhould expreſs himſelf in ſuch a manner as he doth. For when *Celſus* enquires what kind of *Beings* they thought *Angels* to be, *Origen* anſwers, that although the *Scripture* ſometimes calls them *Gods*, it is not with that Intention that we ought to worſhip them. *For*, ſaith he, *all Prayers, and Supplications, and Interceſſions, and Thankſgivings are to be ſent up to God the Lord of all, by the High Prieſt who is above all Angels, being the living Word and God. For to call upon Angels (we not comprehending the knowledge of them, which is above the reach of man) is unreaſonable. And ſuppoſing it were granted that the knowledge of them, which is wonderful and ſecret, might be comprehended: this very*

Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπέμπεσθαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀγγέλου ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου λόγου, καὶ θεοῦ. Ἀγγέλους γὰρ καλεῖσθαι μὴ ἀναμφιβόλως τὸν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπους περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμην ἔχειν εὔλογον. ἵνα δὲ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν ἡ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμη, θαυμαστός τις ὢν καὶ ἀπόρρητος καλαλήφθη. αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστήμη, προσήκουσα τῇ φύσει αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφ' οἷς εἰσιν ἕκαστοι τελειωμένοι ἐάσει ἄλλῳ διαφέρειν εὐχεσθαι ἢ τῷ πρὸς πάντα διαφέρει (διαφέρειν Uſſer.) ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. Orig. c. Celſum, l. 5. p. 233. ed. Cantab.

Knowledge

Knowledge declaring their Nature to us, and the charge over which every one of them is set, would not permit us to presume to pray unto any other but God the Lord of all, who is abundantly sufficient for all, by our Saviour the on of God. In which Testimony, we clearly see what the Judgment of the *Church* then was concerning *Invocation*: For in a matter of *Divine Worship* equally concerning the whole *Church*, we have no Reason to imagine that *Origen* should deliver any private Opinion of his own. And herein we are plainly told, *That all Prayers and Supplications are to be made to God only through Christ*, that in such cases where we are *Ignorant of the nature of Beings*, it is unreasonable for us *to pray to them* (as we certainly are concerning separated *Souls* as well as *Angels*); that in case we did know them, yet it would not be reasonable to pray to them, both because they are inferior and ministring *Spirits*, and that *God* himself is abundantly sufficient for all through *Christ*. Now let any reasonable Man judge, whether these Arguments do not hold as well against a *relative and subordinate Invocation*, as *absolute and Sovereign*. But no such Distinctions were thought of then. For they judged all *Prayer* and *Invocation*, by the very *Nature* of it, to import *Divinity* in that it was made to, and therefore that no created *Beings* how excellent soever were capable of it. From whence *Origen* afterwards supposing the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars* to be *Intellectual Beings*, gives this account, *Why, notwithstanding that,*
l 5. p. 238. *they made no Prayers to them. For*, saith he, *since they offer up Prayers themselves to God through his only Son*, κρίνομεν μὴ δεῖν εὔχεσθαι τοῖς εὐχομένοις, *we judge that we ought not to pray to them that pray, Since they would rather send us to God whom they pray to, than bring us down to themselves, or to divide our praying vertue from God, to themselves.* Can we then suppose that the *Church* at that time did allow of Prayers to be made to *Saints* in *Heaven*, supposing their *praying* there in behalf of the *Church* on Earth? For we see *Origen* goes on this ground, that all *Intellectual Spirits* which pray themselves, are not to be prayed to; and that if they knew of our *praying* to them, they would send us to *God* and not accept of those *Supplications* to themselves which are
L. 8. p. 381. due only to *God*. In the beginning of the eighth Book, *Celsus* disputes against the *Christians* because they worship only the *Supreme God*, without giving any to the *Inferior Dæmons*; and that upon this ground, because, saith he, *They who worship the Inferiour Gods, acknowledging them Inferiour, is so far from dishonouring the Supreme, that he doth that which is acceptable to him* Διότι τιμῶν καὶ σέβων τοὺς ἐκείνους πάντας, οὐ λυπεῖ τὸν θεὸν, οὗ πάντες εἰσί. *For he that honours and worships those who are subject to him, doth not displease God whose they are all.* These are *Celsus* his Words; from whence we are to take notice, that *Celsus* doth not plead for *absolute and Sovereign Worship* to be given to these *Inferiour Deities* or *Spirits*, but only a *relative and subordinate Worship*. So that if the Controversie had been between *Celsus* and a *modern Romanist*, all that *Celsus* here says must have been confessed on both Sides, and the whole Dispute only have been concerning those *Dæmons* or *Spirits* which were to have this relative and inferiour kind of *Worship*, *viz.* Whether those which *Celsus* call'd *Dæmons*, or only the *Blessed Spirits* aud glorified *Saints*. But *Origen* who went upon other Grounds, returns a far different Answer; *For*, saith he, *it is not lest we should hurt God that we abstain from the Worship of*
P. 383. *of any but God according to this Word* (ἐκκλίνομεν τὸ δουλεύειν ἄλλῳ τινὶ ἢ τῷ θεῷ, *to render the inferiour Worship of* δουλεία *to any but God*) *but lest we should thereby*
P. 284. *hurt our selves, by separating our selves from our Portion in God.* And the rea-
P. 385. son he gives why *Christ* is to be worshipped is, *from that Divinity which manifested it self in him, and because of the Unity of Nature between God and him.*

And

And although *Origen* saith, *That in some Sense we may be said* θεραπεύεσθαι *to give some kind of worship to Angels and Archangels*; yet he saith *the Sense of the Word must be purg'd, and the Actions of the Worshippers distinguished.* Yet in the following Words he attributes that *Worship* which is by *Supplication only to God and his only Son.* So that still he reserves *the offering up our Prayers as the appropriate worship to God himself, through his only Son. For to him,* saith he, *we first offer them, intreating him who is the propitiation for our sins, that he would vouchsafe as our high Priest to offer our Prayers, Sacrifices, and Intercessions to God over all. Therefore our Faith is only in God through his Son, who hath confirmed it to us.* And afterwards, *Away* (saith he) *with* Celsus *his Counsel, that we should worship* Dæmons or inferior Spirits not taking them in the worst Sense) μόνῳ γὰρ προευκτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, *for we must only pray to God over all, and to the Word of God, his only begotten, and first born of all Creatures; and we must entreat him, that he as High Priest, would present our Prayer, when it is come to him, unto his God, and our God, and unto his Father, and the Father of them that frame their Life according to the Word of God.* To the same Purpose again in another Place; *To whom we offer our first-fruits, to him we direct our Prayers, having a High Priest, who is entred into Heaven, Jesus the Son of God; and we hold fast this Confession while we live, through the Favour of God, and his Son, who is manifested to us:* And after saith, *That the Angels help forward their Salvation, who call upon God, and pray sincerely, to whom they themselves also pray.* But not one word of any praying to them, but only to God through Christ. For as he saith elsewhere. *We must endeavour to please God only, who is over all, and pray that he may be propitious to us, procuring his good Will with Piety, and all kind of Virtue. But if he will yet have us to procure the good Will of any others, after him that is God over all; let him consider, that as when the body is moved, the motion of the shadow doth follow it: so in like manner, having God favourable to us, who is over all, it followeth that we shall have all his Friends, both Angels, and Souls, and Spirits, favourable to us. For they have a sympathy with them, that are thought worthy to find favour with God. Neither are they only favourable unto such as be worthy; but they co-operate with them also that are willing to serve God over all, and are friendly to them, and pray with them, and intreat with them. So as we may be bold to say, that when Men, who with a Resolution, propose to themselves the best Things, do pray unto God, many Thousands of the sacred Powers pray together with them uncalled upon.* Here indeed we find that *Saints* and *Angels* do interceed in Heaven in behalf of the *Saints* on Earth, but that is not the Thing in dispute between us: But here we find no such thing at all as an *Invocation* of them; but he says, *They pray together with us,* when we pray to *God* himself, not when we pray first to them to *pray* with us. For this *Origen* makes to be wholly needless; *for if God be propitious to us, so will all the Sacred Powers be too.* So that still we find in *Origen*, that *Invocation* was only to be made to *God* over all, although he saith, *That with those who do sincerely call upon God, the Holy Spirits do joyn*

Ἀλλὰ τὸν ἕνα θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγον καὶ εἰκόνα ταῖς κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν ἱκεσίας καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβομεν, προσάγοντες τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ. Orig. l. 8. p. 386.

Id. Ibid.

Id. p. 395

Id. p. 400.

Ἕνα οὖν τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν ἡμῖν ἐξευμενιστέον, καὶ τοῦτον ἱλέω εὐκτέον ἐξευμενιζόμενον εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς βούλεται μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξευμενίζεσθαι θεόν· κατανοησάτω ὅτι ὥσπερ τῷ κινουμένῳ σώματι ἀκολουθεῖ ἡ τῆς σκιᾶς αὐτοῦ κίνησις, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τῷ ἐξευμενίζεσθαι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν, ἕπεται εὐμενεῖς ἔχειν τοὺς ἐκείνου πάντας φίλους ἀγγέλους, καὶ ψυχὰς, καὶ πνεύματα. συναίσθονται γὰρ τῶν ἀξίων τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐμενισμοῦ, καὶ οὐ μόνον καὶ αὐτοὶ εὐμενεῖς τοῖς ἀξίοις γίνονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπράττουσι τοῖς βουλομένοις τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεὸν θεραπεύειν, καὶ ἐξευμενίζονται, συνεύχονται, καὶ συναξιοῦσιν ὥστε τολμᾶν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ἀνθρώποις, μετὰ προαιρέσεως προτιθεμένοις τὰ κρείττονα, εὐχομένοις τῷ θεῷ, μυρίαι ὅσαι ἄκλητοι συνεύχονται δυνάμεις ἱεραί. Orig. l. 8. p. 420.

Arnob. l. 3. *with them.* To the ſame Purpoſe *Arnobius* ſpeaks, when the *Heathens* asked, Why they did not worſhip any *Inferior Gods? ſatis eſt nobis*, ſaith he, *Deus primus, the Supreme God is ſufficient for us.* In hoc omne quod colendum eſt colimus; quod adorari convenit adoramus, quod obſequium venerationis poſcit, venerationibus promeremur. *In worſhipping him, we worſhip all that is to be worſhipped; we adore all, that is fit to be adored; we procure Favour by ſhewing Reverence to all that require it.* Where we are ſtill to take notice, that the *Heathens* did not blame them for not giving the higheſt kind of *Worſhip* to theſe *Inferior Deities*, but for not worſhipping them with the *ſubordinate* and *relative Worſhip*, which they ſaid belonged to them. Now when in the Anſwer he ſaith, *That in worſhipping God, they worſhipped all that was to be worſhipped*; he utterly deſtroys any ſuch *Relative Worſhip*, which may be given to Inferior Spirits.

§. 21. For we are to conſider, that the *Heathens* themſelves did not give the ſame kind of *Adoration* to their *Heroes*, and *Inferior Deities*, which they did to him whom they accounted *Supreme.* And, ſetting aſide the Difference of the Object, I can find no poſſible Difference between the *Invocation* of *Saints* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and that of *Dæmons* among the *Heathens.* And although *Bellarmine* hath taken the greateſt Pains to clear the Nature of that *Worſhip*, which is given to *Saints*; yet, upon a thorow Examination of it, we ſhall find that all his Pleas would have held as well for the Worſhip of *Dæmons* in the *Platoniſts* Senſe of them, as they do for the Worſhip of *Saints* among *Chriſtians.* Three Things he tell us *Adoration* conſiſts in, *An Act of Underſtanding* apprehending ſome Excellency: *An Act of the Will*, whereby we are inwardly inclined to do ſomething by an internal, or exteral Act, by which we declare our Senſe of that *Excellency*, and our Subjection to it; and laſtly, *An external Act*, in which we bow or kneel, or ſhew ſome outward Sign of Subjection. Now of theſe three he ſaith, the *ſecond* is moſt *proper* and *eſſential*, becauſe the firſt may be without *Adoration*, and the laſt with *Irriſion* of that we pretend to worſhip. Further he obſerves that there are ſo many ſorts of *Adoration* or *Worſhip*, as there are Degrees of *Excellency*, of which he reckons three kinds, *Divine*, *Humane*, and *between both*, as the *Grace* and *Glory* of the *Saints*: And that theſe ſeveral ſorts of Worſhip, according to theſe ſeveral Excellencies, are not *univocal*, but *analogical*; and that they may be very well diſtinguiſhed by the *internal Acts*, for the Inclination of the Will is greater or leſs, according to the Degree of *Excellency* apprehended in the Object. But as to the *External Acts*, it is not eaſie to diſtinguiſh them; for, almoſt all *External Acts*, (*ſacrifice* only, and the Things referring to it excepted) are common to all kinds of *Adoration.* This is the Subſtance of what he hath, for explaining the Nature of *Divine Worſhip*: And by which I cannot poſſibly ſee, but that kind of *Worſhip* which was given by the *Heathens* to their *Dæmons*, was defenſible upon the ſame Grounds that the *Invocation* of *Saints* is now. For as theſe apprehend a greater Excelleney in *God*, than in the *Saints*; ſo did they in the *Supreme God*, than in thoſe *Inferiour Deities*; which they did not acknowledge to have an *Infinite Nature* in themſelves, but only that they had the *Honour* of being ſolemnly *worſhiped* beſtowed upon them. But this will be much clearer in the Caſe of the *Heroes*, or the *Apotheoſis* of the *Roman Emperors*, as *Auguſtus* for Inſtance. The *Roman Senate* decrees, that *divine Honours* ſhall be given to *Auguſtus*: we cannot think, that by Virtue of this Decree he aſſumed a *Divine Nature*, or became abſolutely *God*, ſo that the *Act* of the *Underſtanding* was of the ſame Nature, which it would have been, ſuppoſing ſome *Roman Catholick* ſhould

Bellarm. de Sanct. beatitu. l. 1. c. 12.

ſhould believe *Auguſtus* to have been a *Saint*: On which Suppoſition, we will ſuppoſe a *Heathen* and *him* to be at their *Prayers* together to him. I pray now tell me, Wherein lies the Difference, that one is *Idolatry*, and the other is not? For neither of them ſuppoſe him to be the *Supreme God*, both look on him as having a *middle kind of Excellency between God and Man*, the *external Actions* are the ſame in both, and their Apprehenſions of Excellency being equal, the *Inclinations* of their *Wills* to teſtifie their Devotion muſt be equal too. If you anſwer me, that one looks on him as a *Saint*; and the other doth not; I may ſoon tell you, that is nothing to the Purpoſe, for, the Queſtion is not, Whether he was a *Saint* or no, but, Whether the *Apprehenſion* of a *middle Excellency* between *Divine* and *Humane*, with a correſpondent Inclination of the *Will*, teſtified by external *Acts* of *Adoration*, be *Idolatry* or no? If it be *Idolatry* in the one, it muſt be in the other; for the *ratio formalis* is the ſame in both, *viz.* the *Apprehenſion* of an *Excellency* between *Divine* and *Humane*: For we are not enquiring, Whether the Apprehenſion be true or falſe, but, What the Nature of that *Act* of *Religion* is, which is conſequent upon ſuch an *Apprehenſion*. Now if it were not *Idolatry* in him, that believed *Auguſtus* to be a *Saint*, and worſhipped him; How can it be made appear to be ſo in him, that believed him *deified*, or that *Divine Honours* did belong to him? And if this be granted; for my part, I cannot tell how you can excuſe the *Primitive Chriſtians*, that would rather ſuffer *Martyrdom*, than worſhip the *Heathen Emperors*; for, although they all thought it *Idolatry*, yet upon theſe Principles it could not be ſo; but the worſt that could be made of it, was this, That the *Senate* took that upon it, which it had nothing to do with, becauſe it belonged to the *Pope* to *Canonize* Men, and not to the *Roman Senate*. For, let me put it ſeriouſly to you, Whether you do not attribute the very ſame kind of *Authority* to the *Pope* now, which the *Roman Senate* challenged in the ἀποθέωσις, of the *Roman Emperors*? For, whoſoever will compare the Rites of *Canonization* in *Bellarmine* with the ancient Rites of the ἀποθέωσις, will find them exactly anſwering to each other. For, 1. *They are put in a Catalogue of Saints, and muſt be owned by all for ſuch.* 2. *Invocantur in publicis Eccleſiæ precibus, They are prayed to in the publick Prayers of the Church.* 3. *Temples and Altars for their ſake, are dedicated to God.* 4. *The Sacrifices of the Euchariſt, of Prayers, and Praiſes, are publickly offered to God for their Honour*; and then follow their *Feſtivals*, *Images*, *Reliques*, &c. What was there more done then, that publick *Divine Honours* were made to the *Deified Emperors*; not that theſe *Honours* were wholly terminated upon them, but they thought the giving of this relative *Honour* to them, did redound to the greater *Honour* of the *Supreme Deity*? So that we ſee, a new object of *Divine Worſhip* is ſolemnly appointed, upon the *Pope's Canonizing a Saint*; and no Pretence can be made to excuſe this from *Idolatry*, which would not have excuſed all thoſe *Heathens* from it, who believed there was one *Supreme Deity*, and yet allowed *Divine Honours* to be given to ſuch *Spirits* which were imployed by him, or attended on him. So that if the Notion of *Idolatry* muſt only lie in ſuch an act of the *Will*, which reſults from an Apprehenſion of *Infinite Excellency*, which is only in the *Supreme Being*; very few, if any, of the more *intelligent Heathens* were ever guilty of it. But if the formal Reaſon of their *Idolatry* lay in offering up thoſe *Devotions to that which was not God*, which only belong to an *Infinite Being*; I ſee not, but the ſame Charge will hold on the ſame Grounds, againſt thoſe who *Invocate Saints* with thoſe *external Acts of Devotion*, which are confeſſed to be the ſame with thoſe wherewith we call on *God*. But nothing can be more unreaſonable, than that

De Sanct. beat. *l.* 1. *c.* 7.

Bellarmine ſhould except *Sacrifices*, and things belonging thereto, from being common to the firſt and ſecond ſort of *Adoration*, and not except *Invocation*. For, Is it poſſible to conceive any Act which doth more expreſs our ſenſe of an *Infinite Excellency*, and the Profeſſion of our *Subjection* to it, than *Invocation* doth? Which doth it far more than *Sacrifice* doth; for that being a meer external Act, is conſiſtent with the greateſt Mockery of *God*; but *ſolemn Invocation* implies in its own Nature our Dependence upon *God*, and an Acknowledgement of his *Infinite Knowledge* and *Power*. For *Invocation* lies chiefly in the internal *Acts*, and denotes primarily the inward deſire of obtaining ſomething from a *Being* above our own: So that, though I ſhould grant the meer *external Acts* of *bowing* and *kneeling* to be common to *Adoration* given to *infinite* and *finite Perfections*; yet I utterly deny that theſe *Acts* are common to both, when the Circumſtances do determine the *End* and deſign of them. As no Man by the meer bowing of *Abraham* to the *Children* of *Heth* could tell, whether it were civil or divine *Adoration* which he meant; but none who underſtood all the Circumſtances of it, would have any Reaſon to queſtion it. But, ſuppoſe it had been declared before, that theſe Men expected a more than *civil Adoration*, and that all the Rites of ſolemn *Invocation* which *Abraham* at any time uſed to *God*, muſt be uſed to them too; then the ſame external *Acts* muſt have received a new Denomination. So that though the meer *external Acts* be common to *civil* and *religious Worſhip*, yet as thoſe *Acts* are conſidered with their ſeveral *Circumſtances*, they are appropriated to one or the other of them. Thus, though a Man may uſe the ſame form of *Words* to an *Emperor* on his Throne, and the ſame external *Poſture*, which he doth uſe after his Death in a *Temple* conſecrated to him; yet in the one they are meerly Signs of *Civil Worſhip*, but in the other they become Teſtimonies of *Religious Adoration*. So, although in the *Invocation* of *Saints*, no other Words were uſed, but ſuch as denote them to be *Creatures* ſtill; yet if they be uſed with all the Rites of ſolemn *Invocation*, in Places appropriate to *Divine Worſhip*, and in *Sacred Offices*, they thereby declare the *Adoration* intended to be greater than any meer Creature is capable of. For we muſt conſider, that as *God* is owned to be *Infinite* in himſelf, and to have incommunicable Perfections, ſo by reaſon of them there ought to be ſome appropriated Acts or Signs of Worſhip, to declare our Subjection to him; which being determined for this end, either by the *Law* of *God*, or the *Conſent* of People, the attributing of them to any elſe but him, is a publick *Violation* of his *Honour*. Although in ſo doing, Men profeſs that they intend them only as Expreſſions of a lower kind of *Worſhip* than is due to the *Supreme Being*. But in ſuch caſes the *Proteſtation* avails not, where the *Fact* is evident to the *contrary*. For when Men in the moſt ſolemn manner, in publick places of *Devotion*, and in *ſacred Offices*, do invocate *Saints*, and yet think they diſhonour not God by it, becauſe they ſay, they do not worſhip them as *God*; it is juſt as if a Man ſhould upon all Occaſions, in the Preſence-Chamber, addreſs himſelf to one of the *King*'s Subjects as to the *King* himſelf; and being queſtioned for it, ſhould only ſay, he did not diſhonour the *King* by it, becauſe he meant it not to him as a *King*, but as a *Subject*. But by ſo much is the *Diſhonour* greater, becauſe the *Sovereignty* of the *King* doth require that the Rights of *Majeſty* ſhould not be given to any *Subject* whatſoever. So that it is but a vain Pretence, when Men uſe all the Expreſſions whereby we declare our Senſe of the *Infinite Perfections* which are in *God*, to any *Creatures*, to ſay, *They give them not that Worſhip which belongs to God*, meerly becauſe they do believe they are *Creatures* ſtill. But, Is it poſſible for Men to give the Honour which is due to *God*, to the *Creatures*, acknowledging them to be *Creatures* ſtill? or,

Is

Is it not? If not, then none of the *Heathens* could be guilty of *Idolatry*, in worſhipping *Dæmons*, *Heroes*, and *Deified Emperors*; if it be poſſible, then the acknowledging the *Saints* not to be *God*, cannot excuſe Men from the ſame kind of *Idolatry*, in the *Invocation* of them. And it is as frivolous a Plea which is made for thoſe Forms of *Invocation* which are made to the *Saints* in plain Terms, not to intercede with God for them, but to beſtow upon them both temporal and ſpiritual *Bleſſings* (of which Multitudes have been produced by our Writers) *viz. That though the Form of Words be the ſame that is uſed to God, yet the Senſe is wholly, that they would pray to God to beſtow them.* For, How ſhould any other Senſe be underſtood, when theſe Forms are allowed in *Invocation*? For, although the *Scripture* may ſometimes attribute the effect to the ſubordinate *Inſtrument*, as when S. *Paul* is ſaid *to ſave ſome*, yet certainly the *Scripture* is far from allowing ſuch a Liberty in ſolemn *Invocation*: For upon this Ground it might have been lawful for Men to have fallen down upon their Knees to S. *Paul*, and have intreated him to ſave them. Do you think S. *Paul* would have approved ſuch Phraſes in *Invocation*? So that it is not the meer *Phraſe*, but as it is joined with all *Rites* of *Invocation*, which makes it look ſo like the moſt groſs *Idolatry*. When you pray to the *Virgin Mary*, *to protect you from your Enemies*, *and receive you in the hour of Death*, and to the *Apoſtles*, *to heal your ſpiritual Maladies*, which Forms are acknowleged by *Bellarmine*; Can any reaſonable Man think, that the meaning of them only is, that they would pray to *God* to do theſe things for them? If one ſhould bring his *Petition* to a *Courtier* for his *Pardon*, and in plain Terms beg that of him which the *King* only can grant: What Man that had his Wits about him, would ever imagine that he only meant by it, that he would entreat the *King* to do it for him? But *God* is more jealous of his Honour, than to be put off by ſuch *Mockeries* as theſe are: Nay, when your great Men at the end of their moſt elaborate Works conclude with a *Laus Deo & beatiſſimæ Virgini*, What can be meant by it, but the attributing an *Honour* of the ſame kind to the one as the other? And when Prayers are made to *Saints*, that through their *Merits* they would do ſuch things for them, it is hard conceiving the meaning ſhould only be, that they would pray to *God* for them. Nay, ſome have expreſly ſaid, That *God hath communicated that which of right belonged to him becauſe of his Divinity and Omnipotency, to the bleſſed Virgin, and the Saints; and, that which is more wonderful, to their Images too.* So *Gulielmus Fabricius* in his Approbation of *Lipſius* his *Diva Virgo Hallenſis*, which it is thought by ſome that *Lipſius* only writ in Imitation of ſome *Heathen Goddeſs*; which may be a very probable account of that otherwiſe very unhappy Undertaking of that learned Man. And as one ſaid of the *Pen* he offered to the *Virgin*, *Nothing could be lighter, unleſs it were the Book he wrote with it.* But that profeſſed *Critick* underſtood well enough the Exactneſs of the parallel of the *Worſhip* of the *Virgin Mary*, with that of the *Heathen Goddeſſes*; and therefore very ſuitably calls her *Tutelaris Diva*, by which his meaning might be gueſſed at, as *Plato*'s was, by his uſing the Name of *God*, or *Gods*. But however that be, we are ſure the parallel is ſo great between the Worſhip of *Saints* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and that of *Heroes* and *Dæmons* amongſt the *Heathens*, that if one be juſtified, the other cannot be condemned, and if one be condemned, the other cannot be juſtified. So that from hence it follows, that the Arguments uſed by the *Primitive Chriſtians* againſt that Worſhip, will hold againſt *Invocation of Saints*; becauſe the *Heathens* pleaded not for an *abſolute* and *ſovereign Worſhip* of them, but only ſuch a kind of *Relative*

Bell. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 17.

Poſt Tacitum exactum, conſummatoſq; labores
Pennam Lipſiades hanc tibi, Diva, dicat.
Nil potuit pennâ levius tibi Diva dicare,
Ni fuerit levius quod tibi ſcribit opus.

relative and *ſubordinate Worſhip*, as you profeſs to be due to *Saints*. Thus much may ſuffice to clear the Notion of *Worſhip* in the *Primitive Church*, and to ſhew, how far that was from approving your Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*.

§. 22. *Athanaſ. Orat. 4. Cont. Arrian. Greg. Nyſſen. Orat. 4. Cont. Eunom. Novatian. de Trin. c. 14.*

The next Argument I intended to have inſiſted on, ſhould have been the proving the *Divinity of Chriſt* from the *Invocation* of him, as *Athanaſius* and ſeveral others do; which could ſignifie nothing, if *Invocation* were then allowed to *Saints*. But this hath been ſo amply managed by others, and the Senſe of the *Church* having been ſufficiently diſcovered by our precedent Diſcourſe; I ſhall not need to inſiſt any more on thoſe foregoing Times, but now come to that Age of the *Church*, wherein the Honour of the *Martyrs* ſeems to be advanced higher upon the ceaſing of *Perſecution*. But ſtill his Lorſhip ſaith, *That the Church then admitted not of the Invocation of Saints, but only of the Commemoration of the Martyrs, as appears clearly in* S. Auguſtine, *who ſaith, Although they be at the Sacrifice named in their Order*, non tamen à Sacerdote qui ſacrificat invocantur? *they are not invoked by the Prieſt who ſacrifices*. Now to this you anſwer, *The Father's meaning is, that the Saints departed are not invocated, or called upon by way of Sacrifice*, i. e. *as Perſons to whom the Sacrifice is offered; which, you ſay, is a Work of Religion due to God only*: and this you prove was all that S. *Auſtin* meant, *becauſe in other places of his Works, where he teaches, that not only Commemoration is made of the Saints departed in Time of Sacrifice, but that it is done to this particular Intent and Purpoſe*, viz. *that they would pray for us; which doubtleſs amounts to a virtual Invocation of them.* And for this you produce *ſeveral Paſſages out of his Works.* Two things therefore muſt be enquired into. 1. What the meaning of S. *Auſtin* is, when he ſaith, *That the Saints are not invocated at the Sacrifice.* 2. What his meaning is, in thoſe Places wherein he allows of that you call *Virtual Invocation*, viz. *that the Saints would pray for us.* 1. We are to enquire, What S. *Auſtin*'s meaning is, when he ſaith, That the *Saints* are not invocated at the *Sacrifice*; *meaning no other*, (ſay you) *but the Sacrifice of the Maſs, which you hope the Reader will mark for S.* Auſtin's *ſake*; wherein you betray moſt egregious Ignorance or Fraud, if you either ſuppoſe the *Chriſtians* called nothing elſe a *Sacrifice* at that time, but what you now call the *Maſs*, or that they did it in the ſame Reſpect that you do now. A *Sacrifice* of *Prayer* and *Praiſe* indeed they had, and a *Commemoration* of *Chriſt's Sacrifice* in the *Lord's Supper*, but no ſuch thing as a *propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead*; and I pray mark this for your own ſake. But for our better underſtanding S. *Auſtin*'s meaning, we muſt conſider that he is there comparing the *Honours* which the Heathens gave to their *Heroes*, with thoſe which the *Chriſtians* give to the *Martyrs. They*, ſaith he, *to thoſe Gods of theirs, build Temples, erect Altars, appoint Prieſts, and offer Sacrifices; but we do not build any Temples to the Martyrs as to Gods, but raiſe Sepulchres as to dead Men, whoſe Spirits live with God; neither do we build Altars, at which we may ſacrifice to the Martyrs, but we offer up a Sacrifice only to the God of the Martyrs, and of us; at which Sacrifice*, ſaith he, *as holy Men of God, who through their Confeſſion of him have overcome the World, they are named in their Place and Order, but are not invocated by the Prieſt, who offers up the Sacrifice.* Two things may here be underſtood by the *Sacrifice*, either the *anniverſary Sacrifice* of *Praiſe to God*, on the Day of their *Natalitia* or *Martyrdoms*; or elſe the *Celebration* of the *Euchariſt*, which was wont to be done at the *memoriæ Martyrum* chiefly upon that *anniverſary Day*. Now there are many Reaſons to incline me to think that S. *Auſtin* doth not ſpeak of any ordinary celebration of the *Euchariſt*, but of that anniverſary *Solemnity*, which was wont to be kept at the *Tombs* of the *Martyrs*

Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 22. c. 10. P. 291.

tyrs on the Day of their *Sufferings*. Chiefly becauſe S. *Auſtin* is here paralleling the *Honours* of the *Martyrs*, with thoſe of the *Heathen Heroes*; and therefore it was reaſon he ſhould ſpeak of the greateſt *Solemnities* which were uſed for them. Now it is certain that there were ſuch *Anniverſary Days* then kept (by many Paſſages of thoſe times, and ſomewhat before them) eſpecially in the *African Churches*; and at theſe they offered up *ſolemn Prayers and Praiſes to God*. Both which are clear from this Paſſage of S. *Cyprian*, *Sacrificia pro iis ſemper ut meminiſtis offerimus, quoties Martyrum paſſiones & dies anniverſariâ Commemoratione celebramus*: Where we find an *anniverſary Commemoration* and *Sacrifices* offered at them. What theſe *Sacrifices* were, *Rigaltius* in his *Obſervations* on that Place tells us; *Chriſtiani*, ſaith he, *ſacris anniverſariis, laudes Deo dicunt; commemoratis eorum nominibus qui pro fide Chriſto dicta Martyrium fortiter obierunt*. So that the *Sacrifice* was a *Sacrifice* of *Praiſe* to *God* in Behalf of the *Martyrs*. At which they had their *Orationum Sacrificia* too, as *Tertullian* calls them, who ſaith, *Under the Goſpel the pure Sacrifice is Prayer to God; and that the Sinner being cleanſed, ought to offer to God*, munus apud Templum, orationem ſcil. & gratiarum actionem apud Eccleſiam per Jeſum Chriſtum Catholicum Patris Sacerdotem, *a Sacrifice in his Temple*, viz. *Prayer and Praiſe in his Church through Jeſus Chriſt the Catholick High Prieſt of his Father*. Hence S. *Cyprian*, *Quando in Sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus*, which *Rigaltius* explains by the *publick Prayers, which the Prieſt made for the People, and underſtands it wholly of the Sacrifices of Prayers*. So that theſe ſolemn Thankſgivings to *God* in behalf of the *Martyrs*, and the *Prayers* which were made for others, are thoſe *Sacrifices* which did belong to theſe anniverſary *Solemnities*, *Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annuâ die facimus*. Thoſe *oblationes pro natalitiis*, were nothing elſe but theſe ſolemn Euchariſtical *Sacrifices* in behalf of the *Martyrs Sufferings*, which were called their *Natalitia*. Now to apply this to S. *Auſtin*, among the *Honours* belonging to the *Martyrs*, he mentions the *Sacrifice* which was offered to *God* in Commemoration of them, and, What can this be other than on that *anniverſary Solemnity* which *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* mention, that was duly kept on that Account? Now at this *Sacrifice*, ſaith he, *they are named in their Order, but not invocated*. Which being underſtood of the anniverſary Day, and of the *Sacrifices* of *Prayers* and *Praiſes*, nothing can be more expreſs againſt *Invocation* of *Saints*, than this place is. For, if ever they were ſolemnly *invocated*, it certainly would be on the Day of the great Solemnity for them; and if then all *Prayers* and *Praiſes* were looked on as due only to *God*, as *Sacrifices* belonging to him, then it cannot but be a robbing *God* of his *Honour*, to offer up either *Prayers* or *Praiſes* to any but himſelf. But, becauſe it was the Cuſtom at thoſe Solemnities, to have the *Euchariſt* adminiſtred, and that S. *Auſtin* afterwards mentions this, I ſhall not exclude the *Euchariſt* here, yet that *Sacrifice* may ſtill comprehend all the *Supplications* which were then uſed; and if the *Saints* were not *invocated* then, we have reaſon to conclude they were not at all. For the *Commemoration* of the *Martyrs* was made after the *Ite, miſſa eſt*, and the *Catechumens* were departed; ſo that there was no ſuch occaſion for their *Invocation* at any other time, as then. So that if there were no *Invocation* of them at the *Sacrifice*, much leſs was there out of it; ſince all the *Solemnities* concerning the *Martyrs* were uſed in the time of *Celebration*. Thus we ſee, this Place of S. *Auſtin* is full and clear againſt *Invocation* of *Saints*, and we muſt now enquire into what he ſaith elſewhere. Only we take notice here, that S. *Auſtin* not only appropriates *Sacrifices* as a thing peculiar to *God*, but *Temples* and *Altars* too. And that *Sacri-*

Cyprian. ep. 34. p. 53.

Rigalt. obſ. ad Cyprian p. 50.

Tertull. c. Marcion l. 3. p. 497. l. 4. p. 502.

P. 512. Ed. Rigalt. Cypr. ep. 15.

Tertull. de Coron. Milit. c. 3.

fice

fice which was then appropriated to *God*, was not a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, but *Eucharistical* and *Supplicatory*; and by Consequence, if Sacrifice only belongs to God, then all *Thanksgiving* and *Invocation* doth too. For both those, we see, were comprehended by the *African Fathers* under the *notion* of *Sacrifice*.

§. 23. We proceed now to enquire, what S. *Austin* saith elsewhere; *Whether he doth any where else allow Invocation as due to Saints?* For which we must consider that S. *Austin* every where appropriates all Acts of *Religion* only to *God*; for he expressly saith, *That we must only ask of God that good which we hope to do; that God alone must be served by the Soul, because he alone is the Creator of it: and that every glorified rational Creature, is only to be loved and imitated; that we ought not to apply our Religion to yield Service to the dead; that they must be honoured for Imitation, not worshipped for Religion. That Religion is nothing else but the Worship of God, and therefore we ought not to consecrate our selves to any thing else, by any Religious Rites. That those who have gone to Angels, instead of God, have fallen into many Illusions and deceitful fancies.* Now is it conceivable, that a Person constant to himself, should so often, and on such good Grounds assert, that all *Acts* of *Religion* belong only to *God*, and yet withal ascribe religious *Invocation* as due either to *Saints* or *Angels*? But we must further consider, that the Ground of S. *Austin*'s distinguishing between Λατρεία and Δουλεία, was not to assert different degrees of *religious Worship* but to make different kinds of *Worship* of those two; the one being properly *religious* Worship, the other only *cultus dilectionis & societatis*, as he calls it, *a Worship only of Love and Respect*. So that we quarrel not with the Distinction it self, but with your misapplying it. *For* S. Austin *plainly makes the honour given to Saints departed, to be of the same nature with that which is given them, while they live: All the difference is*, saith he, *we may render that Honour to them with the more Confidence, after they have overcome.* But still adds, *That all religious Worship is proper only to God.* The only Difficulty then is, What is to be understood by those other Passages you produce out of him. And this we have gained already, that they cannot be understood of any *religious Worship*, without an apparent Contradiction. Your first Citation is, *That the Commemoration of Martyrs at the Holy Table, is not that we should pray for them, but rather that they should pray for us.* To the same Purpose the second is, *That it is an Injury to pray for a Martyr, to whose Prayers we our selves ought to be recommended.* The only Things which can be drawn from hence are, that the *Martyrs* do pray for the *Church* on Earth, and that we ought to recommend our selves to their Prayers: But what is this to an Invocation of them, when it doth not so much as imply a direct desire of them to pray for us? When this recommending our selves to the Prayers of the *Martyrs*, is probably understood of nothing else, but a desire that *God* would hear the *Prayers* which the *Saints* in *Heaven* do make on our Behalf, without any Address to the *Martyrs* themselves, that they would pray for us. Which seems very unreasonable, without good Assurance that they did hear or understand those Requests of that Nature which are made to them. It is not therefore the saying that *the Saints do pray for us*, which makes it either *lawful or profitable* for us to pray to them. For since they ascribe that *Honour* as alone due to *God*, so ought we to do too; and I can hardly see how the very praying to *Saints* to pray for us, being performed with all the Rites of *solemn* and *religious Invocation*, can be excused from attributing that *Honour* to the *Creature* which is due only to the *Creator*. And therefore I cannot but wonder at those who would make this only of the same Nature, with our desiring *Fellow Christians* to pray

S. Augustin. Enchirid. c. 114. De quantitate animæ, c. 34. De verâ Relig. c. 55. De Civit. Dei, l. 10. c. 1. c. 4. l. 5. c. 15. l. 7. c. 32. Epist. 49. quæst. 3. Epist. 63. Confess. l. 10. c. 42.

Colimus ergo Martyres eo cultu dilectionis & societatis, quo & in hâc vitâ coluntur Sancti homines Dei. Cont. Faustum, l. 20. c. 21.

Tract. 84 in Johan. De verbis Ap. serm. 17. (not.) 34.

pray for us. For is there no difference between a Man's intreating a *Courtier* to preſent his Petition to the *King*, and his falling down on his *Knees* to him with all the ceremony due to the *King* himſelf; and then put it off, with ſaying, that in all that, he only deſired him to ſue to his *Majeſty* in his behalf? Although therefore we condemn not the ſolemn praying to *God*, not only to hear the prayers of the *Church Militant*, but of that part of it which is *triumphant* in behalf of the other in *General*; yet this falls far ſhort of ſolemn *addreſſes* in places of *Divine worſhip*, and in *Sacred Offices* to the *Saints*, that they would pray for us. This is it, which as to that you call *virtual Invocation*, you ſhould have proved out of S. *Auſtin*; and yet even that falls much ſhort of that *direct* and *formal Invocation* which is both uſed and allowed in the *Church* of *Rome*. But you offer at a further proof of a direct *Ora pro nobis* in S. *Auſtin*. *For* (ſay you) *S.* Auſtin *doth profeſs it to be the General cuſtom of Chriſtians in their recommending themſelves to the Saints, to ſay*, Memor eſto noſtri; *which ſurely no man will contend to ſignifie leſs than* ora pro nobis. I grant, it ſignifies as much where S. *Anſtin* uſes it; but if you had conſulted the place, you might eaſily have ſeen how wholly impertinent it is to your purpoſe. For S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks not at all there of *Saints* departed, but of them *living*; and that it was a common thing among *Chriſtians* to ſay to any of them *Memor eſto mei*, Remember me in your prayers; which appears by the whole ſcope of that *Chapter*, where he ſpeaks of giving *alms*, and the effect of them on thoſe who received them in making them mindful of them. It cannot be denyed, but ſome of them did uſe ſuch expreſſions to thoſe who were near their *Martyrdom*; but ſtill this only ſhews the requeſting it of them, when they were ſure they heard them; but it proves not any ſolemn *Invocations* of them when they were dead. But if we ſhould grant, that there are expreſſions intimating a *deſire* that *Saints* in Heaven ſhould pray for them, which is the utmoſt you can make of the citation out of the *Sermon* on S. *Stephen* (which with the reſt *de Sanctis* is vehemently ſuſpected, and the other on *Job* is counterfeit) yet there is a great deal of difference to be put between ſuch a calling upon *Martyrs* (of whom only S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks) out of a deſire of their Prayers; and a ſolemn and direct praying to them in the moſt *Sacred offices* and *publick devotions*, which is uſed and approved in your *Church*. For whatever there might be of *private devotion* (not to call it *ſuperſtition*) this way in S. *Auſtin*'s time, in deſiring the *prayers* of *departed Saints* whom they could have no ground at all to believe they heard them; yet you can bring no evidence of any *uſe* of this in the *publick offices* of the *Church*, much leſs of that direct *Invocation*, which we moſt of all charge your *Church* with. That then which began in meer *hypothetical addreſſes*, went ſomewhat further, when they began to grow more confident that in ſome extraordinary way or other the *Saints heard* them; but ſtill this kept it ſelf within the bounds of the *cultus dilectionis & ſocietatis*, that *reſpect* which aroſe from *Love and Communion*; but it was a good while after before it obtained a place in the *publick Offices*, and yet longer, before it came to that height of *Religious Invocation*, which is more practiſed than pleaded for in the *Church* of *Rome*. For although great endeavours be uſed to ſmooth over theſe groſs abuſes with fair diſtinctions, of *relative and abſolute*, *direct and indirect worſhip*; yet the general practice is uncapable of being *palliated* by theſe narrow coverings, there being the moſt *formal* and *direct Invocations* uſed to *Saints* for ſpiritual and temporal bleſſings. Which being allowed of in common practice and the moſt *ſacred Offices*, can never be excuſed from as great *Idolatry* as the Heathens were guilty of, in the worſhip of their *Inferiour Deities*.

De Civit. Dei, l. 21. *c.* 27.

Spalat. oſten. err. Suarez. c. 2. ſect. 20. Wicel. via. regia de Invocat. Sanct.

I conclude this therefore with that of *Spalatenſis*, *Religious Invocation* of *Saints* is *Heatheniſm*; *and meer civil Invocation of them*, though not ſo bad, is yet *dangerous*. And therefore *Wicelius* juſtly ſaith, *That the Invocation of Saints, is to be caſt out of the Church, becauſe it aſcribes God's honour and attributes to his creatures, and derogates from the Office and Glory of Chriſt by making Saints, Mediators and Interceſſors.*

§. 24. Pag. 276.

Which is that we now come to conſider. For, as his Lordſhip ſaith, *When the Church prayed to God for any thing, ſhe deſired to be heard for the mercies and the merits of Chriſt, and not for the merits of any Saints whatſoever. For I much doubt, this were to make the Saints more then Mediators of Interceſſion, which is all that you will acknowledge you allow to the Saints. For, I pray, is not by the merits more than by the Interceſſion? Did not Chriſt redeem us by his merits? And if God muſt hear our prayers for the merits of the Saints, how much fall they ſhort of ſharers in the mediation of Redemption? Such prayers as theſe the Church of* Rome *makes at this day, and they ſtand (not without great ſcandal to Chriſt and Chriſtianity) uſed and authorized to be uſed in the Miſſal.* To this

P. 291.

you Anſwer in two things. 1. *That ſuch Prayers as theſe, are uſed in Scripture.* 2. *That they are no derogation to the Merits of Chriſt.* For the firſt, you ſay, *Solomon*, Pſal. 132. *prays to God to hear him, in effect for the merits of his Father* David *deceaſed, when he ſaith*, Memento, Domine, David & omnis manſuetudinis ejus, *Lord remember* David *and all his meekneſs, &c. This* (you ſay) *cannot be underſtood of God's Covenant and Promiſe made to* David (*as Proteſtants vainly pretend*) *but of* David's *Piety and Virtue by which he was acceptable to God. For which reaſon he adds again, For thy ſervant* David's *ſake turn not away the face of thine Anointed. The like was done by* Daniel, Moſes, Hieremias *and other Prophets praying unto God, and deſiring their petitions might be heard for* Abraham, *for* Iſaac, *for* Iſrael's *ſake, and for the ſake of other holy Men, who had lived before, and been in their times perſons acceptable to God.* And for this you quote St. *Auſtin* and *Chryſoſtome*. So far you have very fairly rendred *Bellarmin* exactly in *Engliſh*. But we are yet to ſeek, Why all thoſe expreſſions in *Scripture* are not to be underſtood of the *Covenant* and *Promiſe God* made with thoſe Perſons who are mentioned by you. For it is conſiderable, that you inſtance in none but ſuch whom *God* had made an expreſs *Covenant* with, as with the *Patriarchs*, and with *David*. But ſince you ſay, *That this Anſwer hath not the leaſt ground from the Text*, therein you out-do *Bellarmin*, and ſpeak that which the Text evidently contradicts you in. For *Pſal.* 132, 11. next after thoſe very words, *For thy ſervant* David's *ſake*; it follows, *The Lord hath ſworn in truth unto* David; and, in the following verſe, the Covenant God made with *David* is mentioned. *If thy Children will keep my Covenant and my Teſtimony that I ſhall teach them, their Children alſo ſhall ſit upon thy throne for evermore.* You had then much conſulted the Text when you ſay, *This expoſition had not the leaſt ground from it*; for that ſpeaks expreſly of the *Promiſe and Covenant which God made with* David. And what you add to the text, *of* David's *Piety and Virtue*, we may more juſtly ſay, *hath not the leaſt ground from it*. For the word doth not ſignifie *meekneſs* but *affliction*, and therefore *Aquila* renders it κακωχίας, *Symmachus* κακώσεως, and ſome old *Copies* ταπεινώσεως, all referring not to *David*'s *merits*, but to his *ſufferings*. And it is not improbably conceived by ſome, that this *Pſalm* is not of *Solomon*'s penning, but of *David*'s; and that at the time when the *Ark* was to be brought back from the *Houſe* of *Obed Edom* to *Hieruſalem*. And in all thoſe other places of *Scripture* mention'd, referring to *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*; the *Scripture* is very plain, that they are to be underſtood of the

De Sanct. beatitud. l. 1. c. 19.

Covenant

Covenant God made with them: As appears by the very words of *Moſes*, *Remember* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Iſrael *thy ſervants, to whom thou ſwareſt by thine own ſelf*, &c. And *God* himſelf ſpeaks often *of his remembring his Covenant which he made with* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob; and that is the ground why the *Prophets* afterwards plead the remembrance of thoſe Perſons, becauſe the *Covenant* made with them was the foundation of all thoſe Bleſſings which the *Childern* of *Iſrael* expected afterwards. The utmoſt that can be made of St. *Auguſtin*'s Teſtimony is, *That God may ſometimes ſhew favour to a People that hath deſerved ill at his hands for the ſake of ſuch as pray for them*; as he did to the people of *Iſrael* for the ſake of *Moſes*. And all that St. *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, is, *That God may ſhew mercy to wicked Men for the ſake of their righteous Anceſtors who are dead.* But this is no more than he hath promiſed, That he will ſhew mercy to them that love him to the third and fourth *Generation*. But there is a great deal of difference to be made between the expreſſions of *God's bounty* and the *Foundation* of our *prayers*; which ought to be only a *promiſe* of *God*. And in this Caſe we deny it not to be lawful, to pray that *God* would remember his Promiſe: but that is a quite different thing from *praying* that we may receive Bleſſings through the merits of the *Saints* in Heaven. So that it cannot be hence concluded, that 'tis no unwarrantable thing to pray that *God* would hear us for the *merits* of the *Saints*.

Exod. 32. 13. Exod. 6. 5, 8. Levit. 26. 42. 45.

Aug. in Exod. queſt. 49.

Chryſoſt. hom. 42. *in Gen. hom.* 27. *in Matth.*

But this will be further explained now we come to ſee, how you vindicate this from being any derogation to the *merits* of *Chriſt*. *We believe*, ſay you, *and confeſs that Chriſt alone is our Redeemer*; *and that he, and none but he, by the juſt price of his moſt precious blood, hath paid our ranſome, and fully ſatisfied the juſtice of God for our ſins*: *all that we deſire of the Saints, either when we mention their merits to God, or ſimply beg their Interceſſion with God for us, is only, that they would join with us in prayer to God, and that God would be pleaſed for their ſakes, whoſe works were ſo grateful to him, to beſtow on us the favours we ask.* When things are ſo odious in the practice of them, that they cauſe all Perſons of any Ingenuity among yourſelves to cry out upon them, then your *Arts* are, To let the ſame practices continue ſtill, but to find out ſome plauſible pretext to colour them over with. As it is here in the buſineſs of *praying to Saints*, and making them thereby to be *Mediators* between God and us; which implying ſo great diſhonour to the All-ſufficiency of the *Merits* and *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt*, you are fain to find out the faireſt excuſes you can make for it, although the practices ſtill continue which overthrow all the diſtinctions you uſe. Thus it is plain, that *direct* and *formal prayers* in your *Church* are made to *Saints*; but, you ſay, *theſe are only to intreat them to pray for us:* You pray expreſly (as his Lordſhip tells you) *That God by the merits and prayers of Saints would deliver you from the fire of Hell*; *that you may obtain the glory of Eternity by their merits*; *and that God would abſolve you from your ſins by their interceeding merits:* And yet for all this, you would have us believe, that you offer no derogation at all to the *Merits* and *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt*. But is it not the great honour of *Chriſt* that his *Merits* and *Interceſſion* alone are *all-ſufficient* to procure all ſpiritual *bleſſings* for us? And can any ſpiritual bleſſings be greater then deliverance from Hell; eternal Glory, and the forgiveneſs of Sins? And when you pray for all theſe through the *Merits* of the *Saints*, how can you poſſibly more diſparage the *all-ſufficiency* of the *Merits* of *Chriſt*? For, if thoſe be ſufficient what need any more? Will *God* grant that for the *Merits* of the *Saints*, which he would not do for the *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt*? Or, do we want the *Merits* of the *Saints* to apply the *Merits* of *Chriſt*? but ſtill ſomething

§. 25.

P. 293.

P. 277.

of weakneſs and defect muſt be implyed in them, if ſome further additional *Merits* be wanting for the application of the former. If a *Prince* ſhould declare to ſome of his *Father's* Subjects, that he would ſatisfie his *Father's* diſpleaſure, and intercede for them that they ſhould have an abſolute pardon; Would it not argue a diſtruſt of the *Prince's* Intereſt to ſollicite ſome *Inferiour Attendants* to intreat the *King* to pardon them for their *ſakes?* And it is here a plain caſe, whatever you pretend, that you do not only pray that the *Saints* would joyn in prayer to *God* with you, but you run to them for *help and aſſiſtance*, in order to the obtaining the greateſt ſpiritual bleſſings from *God*. For ſo the *Council of Trent* expreſly defines, *That it*

Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. ult. *is not only good and profitable to Invocate the Saints, but ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Chriſtum ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere; for the obtaining of bleſſings from God through Chriſt, we ought to fly to their prayers, help and aſſiſtance.* If nothing elſe were meant, but only that the *Saints* ſhould pray for us, What means *help* and *aſſiſtance* mentioned as diſtinct

Catech. Rom. p. 3. p 504. from their prayers? And the *Roman Catechiſm* more fully delivers it (which was publiſhed by order of the *Council of Trent*) *viz. That Saints are not only to be Invocated, becauſe of their prayers to God, but becauſe God beſtows many bleſſings on us*, eorum merito & gratiâ, *by their merits and favour*; and after adds, *Rogati & peccatorum veniam impetrabunt, & conciliabunt nobis dei gratiam*; *Being asked, they will obtain the pardon of ſin, and procure for us the favour of God.* And, What can be more ſaid concerning *Chriſt* himſelf? Although therefore you ſay never ſo much, *That your prayers are made to the Saints through the merits of Chriſt*, and that you conclude all your *prayers, per chriſtum Dominum noſtrum*; yet all this cannot clear you from ſuffering the greateſt diſhonour to the *merits* and *interceſſion* of *Chriſt*, ſince it is plain you rely on the *Saints merits*, in order to the obtaining the

Ibid. *Bleſſings* you pray for. *But*, ſay you, *If the Saints being rewarded in Heaven for their merits, be not injurious to the fulneſs of Chriſts merits, Why ſhould their being heard by vertue of thoſe merits, when they pray to God for us through Chriſt, or our deſire that they may be heard for them, be thought injurious to Chriſt's merits?* To which I anſwer, thoſe *merits* which you ſuppoſe in *Saints*, when they are rewarded in Heaven, have either an *equal* proportion with the *reward* they receive, or not? If not, then they ceaſe to be merits, and the giving the reward, (though an act of *Juſtice*, the Promiſe ſuppoſed) yet in itſelf is holy an act of *Grace* and *Favour*; if they have, then the full recompence is received by that *reward*, and nothing further can be obtained for others on their account. But in the ſenſe it is to be ſuſpected you take *merits* in, we as well aſſert, that the proportioning the *reward* in Heaven to the *merits* of *Saints*, is injurious to the *fulneſs* of *Chriſt's merits*, as their obtaining mercies for others by reaſon of them. Only this latter adds to the diſhonour, in that there is not only ſuppoſed a *proportion* between Heaven and them; but, as though that were not enough, a further *efficacy* is attributed to them, for obtaining *mercies* for others too. His Lordſhip therefore does not *go about to pervert the ſenſe of the prayers uſed in your Miſſal*; but the plain words and ſenſe of them evidently ſhew, how contrary they are to Chriſtian Doctrine and Piety. *Bellarmin's* ſaying, that the *Saints* may in ſome ſenſe be called our *Redeemers*,

1 Cor. 9. 23. cannot be vindicated by that ſaying of S. *Paul*, That *he became all Things to all men, that he might ſave ſome*; becauſe *ſalvation* reſpects the *effect* of *Chriſt's death*, the promotion of which may in ſome ſenſe be attributed to the *Inſtruments* of it, ſuch as S. *Paul* was here on Earth; but *Redemption* reſpects the *merits* by which that effect was obtained, and ſo belongs wholly

wholly to *Chriſt*, and cannot be attributed to any *Saints*, either in Earth or Heaven. When you can prove that any ſubordinate *Inſtruments* of *God's Power* are called *Numina*, you may then excuſe *Bellarmin* for calling the *Saints* ſo; but that is ſo incongruous a ſenſe of the word, that it needs no confutation.

We are now come to the *laſt Error*, which his Lordſhip here charges your pretended *General Councils* with, which is, concerning *Adoration* of *Images*. *Of which*, his Lordſhip ſays, *That the Ancient Church knew it not, And the Modern Church of* Rome *is too like to Paganiſm, in the practice of it; and driven to ſcarce intelligible ſubtilties in her ſervants writings that defend it. And this, without any care had of millions of ſouls, unable to underſtand her ſubtilties, or ſhun her practice.* Here you ſay, *The Biſhop is very bitter*; but no more then the nature of the thing required. All the Anſwer you return to this, lyes in theſe things. 1. *That the Church of* Rome *teaches nothing concerning the Worſhip of Images, but what the ſecond Council of* Nice *did nine hundred years ago; which is, that they muſt be had in Veneration, and due Reverence, but not have Divine Worſhip given to them.* 2. *That Images were in common Uſe and Veneration too, among Chriſtians in the Ancient Church.* 3. *That what abuſes are crept in, are not to be imputed to the Church, but to particular perſons.* This is the ſubſtance of what you ſay to the end of the *Chapter*; as to which a brief Anſwer will ſuffice, becauſe I deſign not a full handling the Queſtion of the *worſhip* of *Images*. If that which you ſay in the *firſt place*, be true, it doth the more prove that which his Lordſhip intends, *viz.* that not *one* barely, but *two* of thoſe you own to be *General Councils*, have erred in this particular. If either thoſe *Councils*, or you, had intended to have dealt fairly and honeſtly with the World, they and you ſhould have declared, what that *Veneration* and *Reverence* is, which is *due* to Images; What difference you put between that, and the *Worſhip* due to *God*; and, Whether the ſame pretences and excuſes would not as well have juſtified the *Pagan Idolatries*? For this was it which his Lordſhip charged you with, that you came too near *Paganiſm* in your practice. But as to this you Anſwer nothing, but that if you do, ſo did the Council of *Nice* too: But, Is that a ſufficient excuſe for you? It is well enough known, What kind of *Council* that was; How much it was oppoſed by the *Synod* of *Frankford*, How many perſons both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, declared themſelves againſt the *Doctrine* of it? But, What a pitiful plea is it for you to ſay, *That the Council of* Trent *had ſilenced all calumnies, by ſaying, That you attribute no Divinity to the Images, but only worſhip them with ſuch honour and reverence as is due to them?* Would not any conſiderate *Heathens* have ſaid as much as this is? But, the Queſtion is, Whether that *Veneration* of them which is uſed by you towards Images, be *due* to them, or no? This you ſhould have undertaken, and ſet the diſtinct *limits* between the *worſhip* due to *God*, and that which is given to theſe. You ſhould have proved, that this is no prohibited way of *worſhip*; for, if it be, it can in no ſenſe be *due* to them. For, ſince *God* may determine the *modes* of his own *worſhip*, what he hath *forbidden* in his ſervice becomes *unlawful*; and, ſo long as that command continues in force, all acts of *worſhip* contrary to it, are a *poſitive* kind of Idolatry. For, as there is a kind of *Natural Idolatry* lying in the *worſhip* of *falſe Gods* inſtead of the *true*; ſo there is that which may be called *Poſitive Idolatry*, which is a worſhipping *God* in a way or manner which he hath *forbidden*. From whence the *Iſraelites* in the *Golden Calf*, and the *Ten Tribes* in the *worſhip* of the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel*, are charged with *Idolatry*, although they acknowledged the

§. 26.

P. 277.

P. 294.

the true *God*, and deſigned that for a *Relative worſhip* to him. If it were ſo then, you ſhould have ſhewed us, How it comes to be otherwiſe now. Where it was, *God* repealed the ſecond *Commandment?* or, What there was in it typical and ceremonial, that it muſt ceaſe to oblige at *Chriſt's coming*? or, What *Reaſons* it was built on, which were only proper to the *Jews*, and cannot extend to the *Chriſtians* too? and, Why *Relative Worſhip*, and the helps for *memory* and *devotion* would not as well have juſtified the uſe and worſhip of *Images*, before *Chriſt* as after? And why the ſame reaſons from the danger of *Idolatry*; low conceptions of *God* (and what other reaſons you will give of that prohibition then) may not hold as well ſtill? Theſe, and many other things, if you would have vindicated the practice of your *Church*, you ought to have inſiſted. But ſince you omit them wholly, and think to put us off with repeating the Decree of the *Council* of *Trent*, you only ſhew the weakneſs of your Cauſe, and of thoſe unintelligible ſubtilties which are uſed to defend it.

§. 27. To what his Lordſhip ſaith, *That, in* Optarus *his time, the Chriſtians were much troubled upon but a falſe report, that an Image was to be placed upon the Altar; What would they have done, if Adoration had been commanded?* You anſwer, *That it was either ſome Idol, or common Image of a Man, or of the Emperor, or the Governor of the Province*, or ſomething or other, but you cannot tell what. But if it had been any of all theſe, how eaſie had it been for them to have vindicated themſelves by ſaying, That if it had been the *Image of Chriſt*, or ſome *Saint*, they would then have worſhipped it, but they could not otherwiſe? But we ſee, it was not becauſe it was ſuch or ſuch an *Image*, that the diſpleaſure was taken, but that it was *any* at all; and this was then juſtly looked on as a ſtrange thing, being ſo contrary to the practice of the *Chriſtian Church*, from *Chriſt*'s time till that. This you deny, and ſay, *That the Images of Chriſt and the Saints were in common uſe and veneration too, amongſt Chriſtians in the Ancient Church.* How is it poſſible to deal with you, that dare with ſo much confidence obtrude ſuch notorious falſities upon the world? There being ſcarce any thing imaginable, in which there are more expreſs Teſtimonies for ſo many Ages together than againſt the uſe or veneration of *Images* in the *Ancient Church.* With what ſcorn and contempt do the *Primitive Chriſtians* reject the uſe of *Images*, and that not in regard of an *abſolute*, but a *relative Worſhip?* If you had read the diſcourſes of the *Chriſtians* in the Primitive times, ſuch as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, *Tertullian*, *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Athanaſius*, *Euſebius*, S. *Auguſtin* where they diſpute againſt the *Heathens*, not meerly for worſhipping *Idols*, but for any worſhip of *Images*, though meerly as they are *ſigns* or *ſymbols* of the proper *objects* of *worſhip*, you could not poſſibly have uttered ſo groſs a falſhood as that foregoing, unleſs you were reſolved to offer violence to your Conſcience in it. If you think the *Council* of *Trent* brings off all this by ſaying, *Men muſt not believe there is any Divinity in Images*, and that it was the worſhip which aroſe from ſuch an apprehenſion which the Fathers diſputed againſt; I aſſure you, you are greatly deceived. For there is no ſuch difference between the *Heathens* apprehenſions, and yours, as to the worſhip of *Images* as you imagine. *Who is ſuch a fool*, ſaith *Celſus*, *to think that theſe are Gods, and not the bare Images of them? You are greatly miſtaken* (ſaith the *Heathen* in *Arnobius*) *if you think that we worſhip the Images for gods; no, we worſhip the gods by and through them*; and therefore ſaith, *That the Ancients were not ignorant that the Images had neither ſenſe nor divinity in them, but only that the rude and ignorant People wanted ſuch things to put them in mind of the gods.*

Optat. l. 3.

Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. Arnob. l. 6.

gods. What is there more than this, that you have to plead for the *Uſe* of them? *Non ipſa timemus ſimulachra* (ſay the *Heathens* in *Lactantius*) *ſed eos ad quorum imaginem ficta, & quorum nominibus conſecrata ſunt*; *We worſhip not the Images, but them to whom they are conſecrated*; which in your language is, *They give them not an abſolute, but a relative Worſhip.* Nec ſimulachrum nec Dæmonium colo, ſed per effigiem corporalem ejus rei ſignum intueor, quam ſolere debeo, ſaith the *Heathen* in S. *Auguſtin*; *I neither worſhip the Image, nor the Dæmon in it, but only by that viſible repreſentation, I am put in mind of that which I ought to worſhip.* If you ſay, *This was not the common ſenſe of them, but only ſome more ſubtile Men aſſerted this, becauſe they could not defend their groſs Idolatries otherwiſe*, the very ſame is moſt true of yourſelves; your diſtinctions are ſuch which the People are not capable of in the *worſhip* they give; and they only ſerve to anſwer thoſe who diſlike ſo palpable an imitation of *Heatheniſm*, as is in the worſhip of *Images.* And it will be hard to find that any *Heathens* had any higher thoughts of their *Images*, or uſed greater acts of Worſhip towards them, than the People of your *Church* do. For, Are not miraculous operations among you aſcribed to *Images* of *Saints*? And what greater Teſtimony of *Divinity* can be ſuppoſed in them? Do not they fall down in the moſt devout manner to them, and make the moſt formal addreſſes before them? and that not meerly with a reſpect to what is repreſented, but with a worſhip belonging to the *Images* themſelves? And, What more than this did ever the *Heathens* do? So that thoſe *Fathers* who ſo much condemned that uſe and *veneration* of *Images* which was among the *Heathens*, muſt needs be underſtood to condemn as much that in your *Church* too. And thence *Euſebius* aſcribes the ſetting up the *Statue* at *Paneas* to a *Heathen cuſtom*; thence *Epiphanius rent the vail at* Anablatha, *wherein the Image of Chriſt, or ſome Saint, was drawn*; thence the *Council* of *Elvira* in *Spain, forbids the placing of pictures in Churches, leſt that which is worſhipped or adored, ſhould be painted on Walls*; thence S. *Auguſtin condemns the worſhippers of Pictures*; thence the *very Art of Painting was condemned in the Ancient Church*, as appears by *Clemens Alexandrius*, and *Tertullian*; and after all this, Is it poſſible to believe what you ſay, *viz. That Images were in common uſe and veneration too in the Ancient Church*? But ſurely we ſhall have ſome evident proof for ſo bold an aſſertion: It were well if there were any thing looked like it. For all that you produce, is only, *That in* Tertullian's *time, the Chriſtians were abuſed with the nick-name of* Crucis Religioſi; *and that in* Chryſoſtom's *time, the Croſs made a glorious ſhew upon the Altar.* And, Are not theſe invincible proofs for the *veneration* of *Images* in the *Ancient Church*? But, why do you not as well ſay, The *Chriſtians* worſhipped an *Aſſe's Head*, the *Sun*, and *Ononychites*; for all theſe are in the ſame Chapter, and equally reckon'd among the falſe Accuſations of the *Chriſtians.* But it ſeems you had rather believe the *Heathens* objection, than the *Chriſtians* denial, whoſe Anſwer we find expreſs to the contrary in *Minutius Felix, Cruces nec colimus, nec optamus, we neither wiſh for, nor worſhip Croſſes*; and *Tertullian*, in anſwer to the former cavil ſaith, *Quod colimus nos, Deus unus eſt*; *That which we worſhip is only God.* They were then ſtrangers to any ſuch *diſtinctions* of *worſhip* as you have invented to anſwer ſuch places with, *viz.* that they did not worſhip them *abſolutely*, but *relatively.* And for all that I can perceive, by the ſame diſtinctions you may prove that the *Chriſtians* did worſhip *Dæmons* and *Heroes*; for, although they deny it never ſo much, I may as well ſay, they meant only by it, that they did not worſhip them with the *Worſhip* proper only to *God*, but with

Euſeb. hiſt. l. 7. c. 18.
Epiph. ep. ad Joh. Hieroſ.
Concil. Eliber. can. 36.
Aug. de morib. Eccleſ. Catch. c. 34.
Clem. Alex. Protrept.
Tertull. ad Hermog. init.
P. 296.
Tertull. Apolog. c. 16.
Minut Fel. p. 33.

Bellarm. de Imag. Sanct. l. 2. c. 28.

with an inferiour and *relative Worſhip*, as you ſay as much concerning Images; by which art you may evade all *denyals* whatſoever. For your place of S. *Chryſoſtom*, the moſt that *Bellarmin* makes of it, is, *That in his time the Croſs was wont to be painted in all places, in Cities, Houſes, Chambers, Veſſels*, not a word in him of *Altars*, which he would not have left out, had he found any ſuch thing in him, but you intended to take care we ſhould not ſearch too far, by not referring us to the *Edition* of S. *Chryſoſtom*, which you, or your Author made uſe of. But, What is all this to the *veneration* of the *Croſs*, if we grant that it did make a glorious ſhew on the *Altar?* Could it not make a glorious ſhew, unleſs they all fell down and worſhipped it? And, Can you think now, that theſe teſtimonies are ſufficient againſt the whole ſtrain of Antiquity, to perſwade Men that the *veneration* of *Images* was uſed in the *Ancient Church?* But you are Men who can believe what you have a mind to; any word, clauſe, or impertinent allegation, that doth but ſeem afar off, to caſt an eye towards you, is preſently the *conſent of all Antiquity*, when the moſt pregnant teſtimonies of the beſt Writers of the *Church* againſt you, are piſh'd at, and ſcorned, or elſe eluded with moſt frivolous interpretations, or laſtly ſuſpected without any ſhadow of reaſon. As the Epiſtle of *Epiphanius*, and the *Canon* of the *Elibcrine Council* have been in this preſent Controverſie. When you ſhall produce your other teſtimonies, an anſwer ſhall attend them; but you muſt not think the ſtory of the *Statue* at *Paneas*, which *Euſebius* attributes to a *Heatheniſh Cuſtom* (beſides the many improbabilities in it) will ever perſwade us, that the *Chriſtians* did then worſhip *Images*. But it would now take up too much time to examine that particularly, with others of a like nature. What I have ſaid already, being ſufficient to give an account of the Senſe of the Primitive *Church*, as to this Subject, which is our preſent buſineſs.

§. 28. We paſs by the reſemblance between the *Feaſts* at the *Oratories* of *Martyrs*, and the *Heathen Parentalia*, *becauſe you ſay now it ſeems wholly extirpated.* And I would not charge you with more faults than you are guilty of, ſince you have enough without it. An evidence of which, is your diſcarding all Perſons from your Communion, who are not ſuch *Bigots*, as

P. 298. to approve all the abuſes and corruptions among you; Which ſufficiently appears by your cenſure of *Caſſandar*; *Who* (you ſay) *ſeemed to many to halt between God and* Baal; *and, although he was not actually excommunicate, yet you would have us believe he was meritoriouſly ſo, becauſe he favoured Hereſie ſo much.* By which we ſee, that we muſt not judge all of the *Roman Communion*, who profeſs themſelves to be of it; for ſo *Caſſander* did to his death. But, whoever offer to find the leaſt fault with the Practices or Doctrine of your *Church*, let them pretend never ſo much to be of it, yet they may be *excommunicate, ſententiâ juris*; and ſo not only *Caſſander* but *Eraſmus, Eſpencæus, Ferus, Barns, Picherellus*, and all other perſons of reaſon and ingenuity among you, ought not to be looked on as *perſons of your* Communion, whatever their pretences be. It ſeems your *Church* bears none but *Hectors*, aud in a ſhort time none ſhall be accounted *Papiſts*, but *Jeſuits:* but it is hard to determine, Whether this diſcovers more the *corruption*, or *tyranny* of your *Church*; which loves her degeneracy ſo much, that ſhe *proſcribes* all who dare in the leaſt to tell her of her *faults*. But,

P. 297. *How can ſhe be found fault with, that take ſuch excellent care to prevent all abuſes, as appears by the caution of the Council of* Trent, *in the preſent Caſe of your worſhip of Images?* For, ſay you, *As to any matter of abuſe in this kind, crept in amongſt the ignorant, we have already ſhewn, how careful the Council of* Trent

Trent *was to prevent and provide againſt all inconveniencies that could reaſonably be foreſeen or feared.* So it ſeems, by the admirable Caution uſed by the *Council* to prevent giving *undue Worſhip* to *Images*, by telling Men, *They muſt only give that which was due*; when all the Queſtion was, What was *due?* and, What not? So it ſeems, by the care uſed to inſtruct the People concerning the Nature of *Divine Worſhip*, and the Danger of *Idolatry*. So it ſeems, by the leaving out the *ſecond Commandment* in the *offices* of frequent *uſe*, leaſt the Peoples Conſciences ſhould check them, for doing that which *God* had ſeverely prohibited. So it ſeems, by the *unintelligible ſubtilties* concerning the nature of that *Worſhip* which is to be given to the *Image*; when yet a miſtake there, makes the Perſon who gives it, guilty of *Idolatry*. So it ſeems, by the continuance of the moſt groſs *abuſes* in this nature ſtill in your *Church*, in this matter of *Images*. Of which ſuch things are related by Eye-witneſſes, that the moſt groſs *Heathen Idolatries* were not more unreaſonable, abſurd, and ridiculous, than they are. And if People continue ignorant, and ſottiſh enough, all is well; but if with *Caſſander*, they charge you with any *Corruptions*, then they ſtand *meritoriouſly excommunicate:* and it is well if they eſcape ſo; for, although *Caſſandar* did, Father *Barns* did not. But, plead as long as you will for the care your *Church* hath taken to prevent all Abuſes in the worſhip of *Images*; as long as the Worſhip of *Images* continues, it is impoſſible to prevent the *abuſes* in it: ſince that is a great *abuſe* itſelf, and gives occaſion to all others. For, the Vindication of your Doctrine depends on ſuch *Mataphyſical Niceties*, which the Minds of People are uncapable of; and, however they may ſerve you in diſputation, are impoſſible to be reconciled with the *practice* of your *Church*, and the Apprehenſions of thoſe who yield the worſhip you allow to *Images*. And therefore it is no wonder at all what *Llamas* relates of the *Spaniſh People*, *that they were ſo beſotted on their old worm-eaten Images, that when they were to have new ones in their rooms, they begg'd with tears to have their old ones ſtill.* But, although *you grant theſe People guilty of Indiſcretion, yet by no means of Idolatry, becauſe they did not call them their gods.* If you think none were *Idolaters*, but ſuch as did believe their *Images to be Gods*; I doubt you may find the number of *Atheiſts* as great as that of *Idolaters* in the World. But if we may gueſs at Peoples *apprehenſions* by their *Actions*, theſe ſeemed as much to believe them to be *Gods*, as any *Heathens* you can inſtance in. Your vindication of *Llamas* from ſaying, *That the Images of Chriſt, and the Saints, as they repreſent their exemplars, have Deity or Divinity in them*; as it is undertaken ſomewhat fearfully, *becauſe* (you ſay) *you hope to clear his meaning, whatever his words ſeem to import*; ſo at laſt it ſtands on the ſandy Foundation of *relative and abſolute Worſhip*, which being taken away, that and your *Images* fall together. I conclude this Subject with his Lordſhip's wiſh; *That men of Learning would not ſtrain their Wits to ſpoil the Truth, and rent the Peace of the Church of Chriſt, by ſuch dangerous, ſuch ſuperſtitious Vanities. For better they are not, but they may be worſe:* And I fear are ſo.

P. 298.

P. 299.

P. 279.

CHAP. IV.

Of the possibility of Salvation in the *Roman* Church.

Protestants Concessions ought not to be any ground to prefer the Communion of the Church of Rome. *How far those Concessions extend. The uncharitableness of Romanists, if they yield not the same to us. The weakness of the Arguments to prove the* Roman *Church the safer way to Salvation on Protestant Principles. The dangerous Doctrines of Romanists about the easiness of Salvation, by the Sacrament of Penance. The Case parallel'd between the Donatists and Romanists, in denying Salvation to all but themselves; and the advantages equal from their Adversaries Concessions. The advantage of the Protestants, if that be the safest way which both Parties are agreed in, manifested and vindicated in several particulars. The Principle itself at large shewed to be a meer contigent Proposition, and such as may lead to Heresie and Infidelity. The Case of the Leaders in the* Roman *Church, and others, distinguished. The Errors and Superstitions of the* Roman *Church, make its communion very dangerous in order to Salvation.*

§. 1. THe main thing which now remains to be discussed, is, Whether the Communion of your *Church*, or ours, be rather to be chosen, in order to *Salvation*. For *that* being the great End of our *Faith*, the tendency to the promotion of that, ought to be the Rule, by which we should embrace or continue in the Society of any *Church*. And, since the regard Men ought to have of their Eternal welfare, doth oblige them to make choice of the best means in order to it, the bare remote *Possibility* of *Salvation* in any *Church*, ought to have no force or consideration at all in the determining their choice in a matter of so great Importance. As, supposing a *Pilot* at *Sea*, whose only desire is to bring his Ship safe into his desired *Port*, should be told, That there are two Passages homewards; the one free and open, in which there is no danger; the other amidst many *Rocks* and *Shelves*, in which yet there is a *Possibility* of escaping: Would not he be accounted a very weak Man, that should chuse this latter way, meerly because it is possible he may escape; and neglect the other, in which there is no danger of miscarrying? So it is here in our present Case, the *Protestants* confess there is a *possibility* for some to escape in the Communion of the *Roman Church*; but it is as Men may escape with their lives in a *shipwreck*; but they undertake to make it evident, there can be no danger, if they observe the Principles of *Protestant Religion*: Would it not be madness in any then to neglect this, and make choice of the other, meerly because *Protestants* agree with you, that there is a *possibility* of *Salvation* for some in the *Roman Church*? Yet this is the great Argument you make use of, whereby to *Proselyte* such Persons, who want Judgment enough to discern the weakness and *sophistry* of it. That therefore we are now to enquire into, is, Whether your Communion, or ours, be more eligible upon Principles of Reason and Prudence, in order to *Salvation*? And two things are insisted on in behalf of your *Church*; first, *That Protestants grant the possibility of Salvation in your Church*, but you deny it in ours, and therefore yours is the safer way. Secondly, *That the Faith of Protestants doth not stand upon those sure grounds which your Faith doth.*

As

As to the *first*, there are two Things to be considered. 1. How *far we grant a possibility of Salvation to those in your Church.* 2. *What can be inferr'd from that Concession in the choice of Religion.* The occasion of entring upon this Debate was the *Lady's Query, Whether she might be saved in the* Roman *Faith*; to which his Lordship answers in *General*, that *the Ignorant that could not discern the Errors of that Church, so they held the Foundation and conformed themselves to a religious Life, might be saved*; *and more particularly to the Lady, that it must needs go harder with her, even in Point of Salvation, because she had been brought to understand very much for one of her condition, in these Controverted Causes of Religion. And a Person that comes to know much, had need carefully bethink himself, that he oppose not known Truth against the Church that made him a Christian*; *for Salvation may be in the Church of* Rome, *and they not find it that make surest of it.* And after, he explains himself more fully, *That might be saved*, grants *but a possibility*; *no sure or safe way to Salvation*; *the possibility, I think, saith he, cannot be denyed to the Ignorants, especially because they hold the Foundation, and cannot survey the Building. And the Foundation can deceive no Man that rests upon it. But a secure way they cannot go, that hold with such Corruptions when they know them. Now, whether it be Wisdom, in such a Point as Salvation is, to forsake a Church in which the ground of Salvation is firm, to follow a Church in which it is but possible one may be saved, but very probable he may do worse, if he look not well to the Foundation*; *judge ye.* So that still his Lordship asserts the *Protestants* way to be the only *safe* way to *Salvation*; and that in the *Church* of *Rome* there is only a *limited possibility* of it, which is such, that he says, A. C. *or his Fellows can take little comfort in.* For as he after declares himself, *Many Protestants indeed confess, there is Salvation possible to be attained in the* Roman *Church*; *but yet they say, withal, that the Errors of that Church are so many, (and some so great, as weaken the Foundation) that it is very hard to go that way to Heaven, especially to them that have had the Truth manifested*; and a little after, *But we have not so learned Christ, as either to return evil for evil in this heady course, or to deny Salvation to some ignorant silly Souls, whose humble peaceable obedience makes them safe among any part of Men that profess the Foundation Christ.* And in another place, *I do indeed for my part (leaving other Men free to their own Judgment) acknowledge a possibility of Salvation in the* Roman *Church. But so, as that which I grant to* Romanists, *is not as they are* Romanists, *but as they are Christians, that is, as they believe the Creed, and hold the Foundation Christ himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross Superstitions of the* Roman *Church. And I am willing to hope there are many among them, which keep within that Church, and yet wish the Superstitions abolished which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their Errors in what they know not, and which hold the Foundation firm, and live accordingly, and which would have all things amended that are amiss, were it in their power. And to such I dare not deny a possibility of Salvation, for that which is Christ's in them, though they hazard themselves extreamly by keeping so close to that which is Superstition, and in the Case of Images comes too near Idolatry.* The substance then of what his Lordship saith, is, That the *Protestant* way is a safe and secure way to *Salvation*; that in the *Roman Church* there is *extream hazard* made of it, which all who love their *Souls* ought to avoid; but yet for such, who by reason of *ignorance* see not the *danger*, and by reason of honesty keep close to *Christ* the *Foundation*, and repent of all miscarriages known or unknown, he dares not deny a *possibility* of *Salvation* for them. But he is far from asserting it of those, who either know the Corruptions of that *Church* and yet continue in them, or such who

P. 280.

P. 283.

P. 285.

P. 299.

wilfully neglect the means whereby they may be convinced of them. So that you strangely either mistake or pervert his Lordship's meaning when
P. 301. you would inferr from these Passages, *That he asserts a possibility of being saved to those who joyn with the* Roman *Church, though their Ignorance be not invincible, and though all or the chief motives which the Protestants bring against you be never so sufficiently proposed to them.* For he still speaks either of such, whose meer *ignorance* doth excuse them where the *Fundamentals* are held, and a Life led according to them, or else of such who condemn your *Superstitions* as far as they are discovered to them, and sincerely desire to find impartially the way that leads to Heaven; Of such as these he dares not deny a *possibility* of *Salvation.*

§. 3. And you are the most uncharitable Persons in the World, if you dare assert the contrary of *Protestants.* You expresly grant *a possibility of Salvation to those who joyn with the Protestant Church, in Case of invincible ignorance*; and dare you deny it where there is a Preparation of Mind to find out and embrace the most certain way to Heaven, where all endeavours are used to that end, and where there is a conscientious Obedience to the *Will* of *God,* so far as it is discovered? If you dare Peremptorily deny a *possibility* of *Salvation* to such Persons, meerly because not of the *Roman Church,* this prodigious uncharitableness would make us question the *possibility* of your *Salvation* more, while you persist in it. For, what is there more contrary to the *design* and *Spirit* of the *Gospel* than this is? From whence must we gather the terms of *Salvation,* but only from thence? But it seems by you, although Men give never so hearty an assent to the Doctrine of the *Gospel,* and live in the most universal obedience to it, and abound in the *Fruits* of the *Spirit* of *God,* of which *Charity* is none of the least; yet if they be not in the Communion of your *Church,* there is no hopes of *Salvation,* for them. But, Who is it the mean while that hath the disposal of this *Salvation?* Is it in your *hands* or *Christ's?* If it be in His, we dare rely on His Promise, although you pretend to know His mind better than He did himself. For, notwithstanding a sincere endeavour to know and obey the Will of *God,* be the great *Fundamental* in order to *Salvation,* which is delivered us by the Doctrine of *Christ*; yet it seems by you, there may be this, where there may be not so much as *possibility* of *Salvation.* By which assertion of yours, you are so far from working upon any, but very weak Persons, to bring them over to your *Church,* that nothing can more effectually prejudice it among all such who dare believe *Christ* to be more *Infallible* than the *Church* of *Rome.* For what is this else, but to make Heaven and Eternal Salvation *stalk* to the *interest* of your *Church,* and to lay more weight upon being in your communion, than upon the most indispensible Precepts of *Christianity?* But when we consider how many among you dispute for the possibility of the *Salvation* of *Heathens,* and yet deny it to those who own all the *Fundamentals* of *Christianity*; when we see how much you lay the weight of Salvation upon being in your *Church,* and what ways you have for those who are in it to reconcile the *hopes* of *Salvation* with the Practice of *Sin,* What can we otherwise imagine, but it is the Interest of your *Church* that you more Aim at, than the *Salvation* of *Men's Souls*? For you have so many ways to give *indulgence* in *Sin* to those who desire it, and yet such ready ways of Pardon, and such an easie task of *Repentance,* and so little troublesome means of obtaining *grace* by the *Sacraments, ex opere operato,* that it is hard conceiving what way a Man should sooner take, who would live in his Sins and come to Heaven at last, than to be of your *Church.* And

yet

yet you who are ſo *ſoft* and *gentle*, ſo *kind* and *indulgent* to the *Sons* of your *Church*, are not more ready to ſend thoſe who are out of it to the *fire* in this World, than to *Eternal Flames* in another. But *we have not ſo Learned Chriſt*, we dare not deal ſo inhumanely with them in this World, much leſs judge ſo uncharitably as to another, of thoſe who profeſs to *Fear God and work Righteouſneſs*, though they be not of the ſame Opinion or Communion with us. Yet, we tell Men of the danger of *hazarding* their *Salvation* by *erroneous Doctrines and ſuperſtitious Practices*, and ſuppoſe that ſufficient to perſwade ſuch who ſincerely regard their future *Happineſs* to avoid all ſuch things as tend ſo much to their eternal *Ruin*. And ſuch who will continue in ſuch things, meerly becauſe there is a *poſſibility* ſome Perſons may be ſaved in them by reaſon of *Ignorance* or *Repentance*, are no wiſer Men than ſuch, who ſhould *ſplit* their *ſhip* upon a *Rock*, becauſe ſome have eſcaped upon a *plank* notwithſtanding. So that conſidering on what terms we grant this *poſſibility* of *Salvation*, this Conceſſion of ours can be no Argument at all to judge yours to be the *ſafer* way; and if upon the ſame terms you deny it to us, it ſhews how much more *unſafe* your way is, where there is ſo much of *Intereſt* and ſo little *Charity*.

But you attempt to prove againſt all *Proteſtants* whatſoever, that yours is the ſafer way to *Salvation*: Your Firſt Argument in ſhort is, *Becauſe we grant that you may be ſaved upon your own Principles, but you deny that we may be ſaved upon yours.* And what is there more in this Argument (but a multitude of Words to little purpoſe) than there is in that which his Lordſhip Examines? For the main force of it lies in this, That is the ſafeſt way which both Parties are agreed in; and therefore although you would have your *Major Propoſition* put out of all doubt, yet that wants more proof than I doubt you are able to give it. For although we grant, Men may be ſaved who have true *Faith*, *Repentance*, and a holy *Converſation without any ſuch Sacrament of Penance, which you make neceſſary for conveying the grace of Juſtification*; yet what ſecurity can thence come to a Man in the choice of his *Religion*, ſince we withal ſay, That where there is a continuance in the corruptions and errors of your *Church*, it is hard to conceive there ſhould be that *Faith* and *Repentance* which we make neceſſary to *Salvation*. You go therefore on a very falſe *ſuppoſition*, when you take it for granted *that we acknowledge, that all thoſe whom you admit to your Sacrament of Penance have all things upon our own Principles which are neceſſary to Salvation.* And ſo your *Minor* is as falſe as your *Major* uncertain, viz. *That many are ſaved in the Roman Church according to the Principles which are granted on both ſides.* But you would ſeem to prove, *That all admitted by you at death to the Sacrament of Penance* (as you call it) *have all things neceſſary to Salvation upon Proteſtant Principles, becauſe*, you ſay, *That Faith, Hope, true Repentance, and a Purpoſe of Amendment are neceſſary to the due receiving the Sacrament of Penance, and theſe are all which Proteſtants make neceſſary to Salvation.* But ſuppoſing, that, Is it neceſſary that all thoſe things muſt be in them, which make the neceſſary requiſites to this *Sacrament* of yours? Do none receive this *unworthily*, as many do a far greater *Sacrament* than this, granting it to be any at all? It ſeems *Salvation* is very eaſie to be had in your *Church* then, for this *Sacrament* is ſuppoſed by you, to be given to Men upon their *Death-beds, when*, you ſay, *It cannot be ſuppoſed that Men will omit any thing neceſſary for the attaining Salvation; and by vertue of this Sacrament they receive the Grace of Juſtification, whereby of Sinners, they are made the Sons of God, and Heirs of Eternal Life.* But I aſſure you, we who believe, Men muſt be ſaved only by the terms of the *Goſpel*, make no ſuch

§. 4. P. 301.

P. 302.

such easie matter of it as you do; we profess the *necessity* of a *through-renovation* of *Heart* and *Life* to be indispensible in order to *Happiness*, for *without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord:* and although we take not upon us to judge the final estate of Men whose *Hearts* we know not; yet the *Gospel* gives us very little ground to think, that such who defer the Work of their *Salvation* to their *Death-beds*, shall ever attain to it; The main design of *Christian Religion* being, The turning Mens Souls from *Sin* to *God* in order to the serving him in this World, that they may be *happy* in another. For if *Salvation* depended on no more than you require, the greatest part of the *Gospel* might have been spared, whose great End is to perswade Men to *holiness of Heart and Life*. It is not a meer *purpose* of *amendment*, when Men can sin no longer, that we make only necessary to *Salvation*: But so hearty a *repentance* of *Sin* past, as to carry with it an *effectual* reformation; without this, Men may flatter themselves into their own *ruin* by your *Sacraments of Penance* and such contrivances of Men, but there can be no grounded hopes of any freedom from eternal Misery. And their *Faith*, too, must be as *weak* as their *Repentance shallow*, who dare *venture* their *Souls* in another World, upon no better *security* than that *By receiving the Sacrament of Penance they are made the Sons of God, and Heirs of Eternal Life.* But you betray Men into stupid ignorance and carelesness as to their Eternal Salvation, and then deal most unfaithfully with them, by telling them, That a *Death-bed Repentance* will suffice them, and the *Sacrament of Penance will presently make them Heirs of Eternal Life.* So that although your *Doctrine* be very unreasonable, and your *Superstitions* very *gross*, yet this unfaithfulness to the Souls of Men makes all true lovers of *Christian Religion*, and of the *Salvation* of Mens Souls, more averse from your *Doctrine* and *Practices*, than any thing else whatsoever. For what can really be more pernicious to the World, than to flatter them into the hopes of *Salvation* without the performance of those things, which, if the *Gospel* be true, are absolutely necessary in order to it? How quietly do you permit the most stupid *ignorance* in such who are the *zealous practisers* of *Fopperies* and *Superstitions?* What excellent arts have you to allure *debauchees* upon their *Death-beds* to you, by promising them that in another World, which our Principles will not allow us to do? How many ways have you to get the *pardon of Sin*, or at least to delude People with the hopes of it, without any serious turning from *Sin* to *God?* What do your *Doctrines* of the sufficiency of *bare Contrition*, and the *Sacraments working Grace ex opere operato*, of *Indulgences*, *Satisfactions*, *regulating the Intention*, and the like tend to, but to supersede the necessity of a holy Life? And at last you exchange the inward hatred and mortification of Sin, for some external *severities* upon Mens *Bodies*; which is, only beating the *Servant* for the *Master's fault*. So that it is hard to imagine any Doctrine or way of *Religion* which owns *Christianity*, which doth with more apparent danger to the Souls of Men undermine the Foundations of Faith and Obedience than yours doth. And as I have at large shewed the former, How destructive your Principles are to the *grounds* of *Faith*; so it hath been fully and lately manifested by a learned *Bishop* of our *Church*, What Doctrines and Practices are allowed in your *Church*, which in themselves, or their immediate consequences, are *direct Impieties*, and *give warranty to a wicked Life.*

Bishop *Taylors* Dissuasive from Popery. *Chap.* 2. §. 5. P. 302.

Which being so of your own side, we must see what Reasons you give for your most uncharitable Censure, *That there are very few or none among Protestants that escape damnation:* And this you call, *The Doctrine of Catholicks.* The Doctrine rather of a proud, tyrannical, and uncharitable Faction of Men; who that they might gain *Proselytes* to themselves, shew how

how little they are themſelves the *Proſelytes* of *Chriſt*. But you offer us a reaſon for it: *Becauſe all Catholicks hold, That neither Faith, nor Hope, nor any Repentance can ſave us, but that only which is joyned with a perfect Love of God; without the Sacrament of Penance actually and duely received: And becauſe Proteſtants reject this, they cannot be ſaved.* But you are not at all the leſs excuſable, becauſe you aſſert ſuch *Doctrines* from whence ſuch *uncharitableneſs* follows, but the dreadful conſequence of ſuch Doctrines ought rather to make you queſtion the *truth* of them. For, can any One who knows and underſtands *Chriſtianity* ever believe, that although he had a moſt hearty repentance for Sin, and a moſt ſincere *love* to *God*, he ſhould eternally periſh, becauſe he did not confeſs his Sins to a *Prieſt*, and receive *abſolution* from him? I can hardly perſwade myſelf, that you can believe ſuch things, but that only ſuch *Doctrines* are neceſſary to be taught, to maintain the *Prieſts Authority*, and to fright Men into that *picklock* of Conſcience, the uſeful practice of *Auricular Confeſſion*. To what purpoſe are all the Promiſes of *grace and mercy through Chriſt* upon the ſincerity of our turning to him, if after all this, the effect depends upon that *Sacrament of Penance*, of which no precept is given us by *Chriſt*, much leſs any neceſſity of it aſſerted in order to eternal Salvation? If this then be all your ground of condemning *Proteſtants*, they may rejoyce in this, That your Reaſons are as weak as your Malice ſtrong. But it would be more fit for you to enquire, whether ſuch who live and die in ſuch a height of uncharitableneſs (whether with or without the *Sacrament* of *Penance*) can be in any capacity of eternal *Salvation*? For that is a plain violation of the *Laws* of *Chriſt*, this other even among yourſelves a diſputable *Inſtitution* of Chriſt; and by many ſaid, not to be at all of that *neceſſity*, which you ſuppoſe it to be. For neither *Medina*, nor *Maldonate*, even ſince the *Council* of *Trent* dare affirm, the denyal of your *Sacrament* of *Penance* to be *Hereſie*; and muſt then the Souls of all *Proteſtants* be ſent to Hell, for want of that, which it is queſtionable, whether it were *Inſtituted* by *Chriſt* or no. But if this *Sacrament of Penance* be ſo neceſſary to Salvation, that they cannot be ſaved who want it, What becomes then of all the *Primative Church* which was utterly a ſtranger to your *Sacrament of Penance* (as ſhall be manifeſted when you deſire it)? what becomes of the *Greek Church* which as peremptorily denies the neceſſity of it as *Proteſtants* do? Both which you may find confeſſed and proved by *Father Barns*, and many teſtimonies of your own Authors are brought by him againſt the *Divine Inſtitution* and *neceſſity* of it. Who very ingenuouſly confeſſes, *That by the Law of Chriſt, ſuch a one by the ſentence of very many Catholicks, may be pronounced abſolved before God, who manifeſts the truth of his Faith and Charity, although he diſcovers not a word of the number or weight of his ſins.* What unreaſonable, as well as uncharitable, men are you then to aſſert, *That no Proteſtants can eſcape damnation for want of that*, which ſo many among yourſelves make unneceſſary for the pardon of Sin? But it is juſt with *God*, that thoſe who are ſo ready to condemn others, ſhould be condemned by themſelves: and if your Conſciences do not condemn you here, your Sentence may be the greater in another World.

P. 303.

Medina de Confeſſ. tr. 2. qu. 4. Maldon. de Sacram. T. 2. c. 3.

Cum ſtando in lege Chriſti præciſe pronunciari poſſit, ex plurimorum Catholicorum ſententiâ abſolutus coram Deo;— qui manifeſtis indiciis probat ſeveram habere fidem & charitatem, etſi nè verbum propalet de numero, & gravitate peccatorum ſuorum. Barns ſect. 8. de pœnit. chufeſſ. & ſatisfactione.

§. 6.

Your ſecond Argument againſt *Proteſtants*, is, *Becauſe they want certanity of Faith by denying the Infallibility of Church and Councils*; but this hath been ſo throughly ſifted already, that I ſuppoſe none who have read the preceding Diſcourſes, will have the leaſt cauſe to ſtick at this: and therefore

P. 304.

therefore we proceed to the Vindication of your Censures from being guilty of the *want* of *Charity*. For you are the Men, who would have us *thank God, when you condemn us to Hell*, that we escape so; and are *angry* with us, that we do not believe that you most *entirely love us*, when you *judge us to eternal Flames*. *For*, you say, *That your denyal of Salvation to us*
P. 305. *is grounded even upon Charity*. If it be so, you are the most *charitable* People in the World, for you deny *Salvation* to all but yourselves and some *Heathens*. *But*, say you, *If Salvation may be had in your Church as Protestants confess, and there be no true Church or Faith but One, it follows that out of your Church there is no Salvation to be had*. To which his Lordship had
P. 284. fully answered, by saying, *'Tis true, there is but One true Faith, and but One true Church; but that One both Faith and Church is the Catholick Christian, not the particular Roman*. So that this passage is a meer begging the question, and then threatning upon it, without all Reason or Charity. And all
P. 306. your declamations about *the way of knowing the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, have been spoiled by what hath been said already upon that Subject. We come therefore to that which is the proper Business of this *Chapter*, which is, to examine the strength of that *Inference* which is drawn from the *Protestants* Concession of the *possibility* of *Salvation* in your *Church*, viz. *That thence it follows, that the Roman Church and Religion is the safer way to Salvation*. Two things his Lordship observes the force of this Argu-
P. 285. ment lies in, *the one directly expressed*, viz. *The Consent of both Parties of the possibility of Salvation in the Roman Church*; the other *upon the By*. viz. *That we cannot be saved, because we are out of the Church*. And of these two he speaks in order. First he begins with the *confession*: as to which his Answer lies in three Things, 1. *That this was the way of the* Donatists *of old, and would hold as well for them, as the Church of* Rome. 2. *That if the Principle on which this Argument proceeds be true, it will be more for the advantage of Protestants than of your Church*. 3. *That the Principle it self is a contingent Proposition, and may justifie the greatest Heresies in the World*. By this methodizing his Lordship's Discourse, we shall the better discern the strength of your Answers to the several particulars of it. In the first place he shews, *How parallel this is with the proceedings of the* Donatists; *for both parts granted,*
P. 286. *that Baptism was true among the* Donatists, *but the* Donatists *denyed it to be true baptism among the Catholick Christians, and therefore on this Principle the* Donatists *side is the surer side, if that Principle be true, That it is the safest taking*
P. 307. *that way which the differing Parties agree on*. To this you answer nothing, but what will still return upon yourselves, and discover the weakness of your Argument. For the Crimes of *Schism, and unsoundness of Faith*, are still as chargeable upon you, though we may grant a possibility of Salvation to some in your *Church*. And I cannot possibly discern any difference between the Judgment of the *Catholicks* concerning the *Donatists*, and ours concerning you; for, if they judged the *Donatists* way very dangerous because of their *uncharitableness* to all others, so do we of yours; but if they, notwithstanding that, hoped that the misled People among them might be saved; that is as much as we dare say concerning you. And you very much mistake, if you think the contrary. For his Lordship no where saith, as you would seem to impose upon him, *That a man may live and dye in the* Roman *Church, and that none of his errors shall hinder Salvation, whatsoever motives he may know to the contrary*. But on the other side, he plainly
P. 296. saith, *That he that lives in the* Roman *Church, with a resolution to live and dye in it, is presumed to believe as that Church believes. And he that doth so, I will not say, is as guilty, but guilty he is more or less, of the Schism which that Church*

first

firſt cauſed by her Corruptions, and now continues by them and her Power together: And of all her damnable Opinions too, and all other Sins alſo, which the Doctrine and miſ-belief of that Church leads him into, Judge you now, I pray, Whether we think otherwiſe of thoſe in your *Church*, than the *Orthodox* did of the *Donatiſts*? So that if the Argument doth hold for you, it would as well have held for them too. And therefore his Lordſhip well infers, *That this Principle, That where two Parties are diſſenting, it is ſafeſt believing that in which both Parties agree, or which the Adverſary confeſſes, may lead Men, by your own confeſſion, into known and damnable Schiſm and Hereſie; for ſuch, you ſay, the* Donatiſts *were guilty of.* And ſuch, his Lordſhip ſaith, *there is great danger of, in your Church too; for,* ſaith he, *in this preſent Caſe there's peril, great peril of damnable, both Schiſm and Hereſie, and other Sins, by living and dying in the* Roman *Faith, tainted with ſo many Superſtitions, as at this Day it is, and their tyranny too boot.* I pray now bethink yourſelf, What difference is there, between the *Orthodox* Judgment of the *Donatiſts*, and ours, concerning your *Church*? And therefore the Compariſon between *Petilian* the *Donatiſts*, and his Lordſhip's *Adverſary* holds good ſtill; for, all your Anſwer depends upon a miſtake of *Proteſtants* granting a *poſſibility of Salvation*, as I have already ſhewed you. And, in what way ſoever you limit this agreement, you cannot poſſibly avoid, but that it would equally hold as to the *Donatiſts*, too; for the Conceſſion was then as great, in order to Salvation, as it is now. P. 298. P. 315.

But you ſay, *Whether he aſſerts it or no, it muſt needs follow from the Biſhops Principles, that there can be no peril of damnation by living and dying in the* Roman *Church, becauſe he profeſſedly exempts the Ignorant, and grants as much of thoſe who do witingly and knowingly aſſociate themſelves to the groſs Superſtitions of the* Roman *Church, if they hold the Foundation Chriſt, and live accordingly*; From whence you argue, *That if neither voluntary nor involuntary ſuperſtition can hinder from Salvation, then there is confeſſedly no peril of damnation in your Church.* And yet his Lordſhip ſaith, *All Proteſtants unanimouſly agree in This, That there is great peril of damnation for any Man to live and dye in the* Roman *Perſwaſion. And therefore* (ſaith he) *that is a moſt notorious ſlander, where you ſay, that they which affirm this peril of damnation, are contradicted by their own more learned Brethren.* By which we ſee the injuſtice of your proceeding, in offering to wreſt his Lordſhip's words contrary to his expreſs meaning: And ſince all your Argument depends upon your Adverſaries Confeſſion, you ought to take that confeſſion in the moſt clear and perſpicuous terms, and to underſtand all obſcure expreſſions ſuitably to their often declared ſenſe. Which if you had attended to, you would never have undertaken to prove that his Lordſhip grants, that there is no peril of damnation in your Church, which he ſo often diſavows, and calls it, *a moſt notorious ſlander*; and, *a moſt loud untruth, which no engenuous man would ever have ſaid.* And even of thoſe perſons whom he ſpeaks moſt favourably of, he ſaith, *That although they wiſh for the aboliſhing the Superſtititions in uſe, yet all he grants them is, a poſſibility of Salvation, but with extream hazard to themſelves, by keeping cloſe to that which is Superſtition, and comes ſo near Idolatry.* Are theſe then ſuch expreſſions which import *no peril of damnation* in the *Roman Church?* And therefore when he ſpeaks of the *poſſibility* of the *Salvation* of ſuch *who aſſociate themſelves wittingly and knowingly to the groſs Superſtitions of the Romiſh Church*; he declares ſufficiently, that he means it not of thoſe who do in heart approve of them, but only of Such, who though they are convinced they are groſs *Superſtitions*, yet think, they may communicate with thoſe who uſe them, as long as they do not approve of them. Which error of theirs, though he looks on it as dangerous, yet not as wholly de- §. 7. P. 302. P. 301.

P. 316. structive of Salvation. But since, your Answer to this is, *That he mistakes very much, in supposing such Persons to belong to your Church and Communion:* you are not aware, How much thereby you take off from the Protestants Confession, since those whom we contend for a Possibility of *Salvation* for, are such only whom you *deny* to be of your *Church's Communion*, and so the Argument signifies much less by your *Confession*, than it did before. Thus we see, how this Argument upon the same terms you manage it against us, would have held as well in the behalf of the *Donatists* against the Communion of the *Catholick Church*. For what other impertinences you mix here and there, it is time now to pass them over, since the main Grounds of them have been so fully handled before.

§. 8. We therefore proceed to the *Second Answer* his *Lordship* gives to this Argument, *viz. That if the Principle on which it stands, doth hold, it makes more for the Advantage of Protestants, than against them.* For if that be safest

P. 286. which both Parties are agreed in, then 1. *You are bound to believe with us in the Point of the Eucharist. For all sides agree in the Faith of the Church of* England, *that in the most blessed Sacrament, the worthy Receiver is by his Faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real body and Blood of Christ, truly and really, and of all the benefits of his Passion. Your* Roman Catholicks *add a manner of this presence, Transubstantiation, which many deny; and the Lutherans Consubstantiation, which more deny. If this Argument be good then, even for this consent it is safer Communicating with the Church of* England, *than with the*

P. 308. Roman *or* Lutheran; *because all agree in this Truth, not in any other Opinion.* You say, *This can hold no farther than Communicating in the belief of this Opinion*; let that be granted; and, Doth it not then follow, that the *Church* of *England*'s Opinion is *the safest* upon your own ground? *No*, say you, *for it is not such a common consent as doth exclude the manner of Presence, by transf. or consubstantiation.* But, How senseless an Answer is this! for the Argument proceeds so *far* as all are agreed: and the Church of *England* asserting that *real presence* which all acknowledges simply *necessary* in order to the effects of it; her Communion is more desirable on this account, than of either of those *Churches* which offer to define the manner of *Christ*'s presence, since even the greatest Men of your perswasion, as *Suarez* and

P. 308. *Bellarmine*, assert the belief of *Transubstantiation not to be simply necessary to Salvation, and that the manner of it is secret and ineffable.* It is therefore quite beside the purpose, when you offer to prove, *that* Suarez *believed Transubstantiation:* for, although he did so, yet since he grants it *not simply necessary to do it*; his Lordship's Argument in behalf of the *Church* of *England* holds firm still, unless you can prove, that *Suarez* held the belief of that to be as *necessary* as the belief of the *real* and *Spiritual presence* of *Christ*. But you, after, attempt at large to prove, *that the real Participation of Christ in the Sacrament in your sense, is quite different from that of Protestants*: If you mean a *corporal Participation*, indeed it is so; but that is not it, which is now enquired after; but, whether you do not allow any *real* and *Spiritual presence* of *Christ*, besides the *corporal manducation* of that you call his *Body by Transubstantiation.* If you do not, you would do well to shew, what *effects* that hath upon the *Souls* of Men; if you do, then still the *Church* of *England* is of the *safer* side, which holds that in which all are agreed. Which is as much as we are here concern'd to take notice of, as to this Subject, the

P. 303. Controversie itself having been so lately handled. 2. His Lordship instances, *in the Article of our Saviour Christ's descent, into Hell; both are agreed as to the Article of descent, but the Church of* Rome *differs in the Explication; therefore it is safer holding with the Church of* England, *which owns the Article without*

without defining the manner. But you say, *He proceeds on a false supposition, for both are not agreed, what is meant by Hell, whether it be the place of the damned or no:* But this doth belong to the manner of *Explication*, and not to the *Article* itself, which both equally own, and therefore the *Church* of *England* hath the advantage there. 3. He instances in the *Institution of the Sacrament in both kinds*; *in which it is agreed by both Churches, that Christ did institute it so, and the Primitive Church received it so. Therefore according to the former Rule, 'tis safest for a Man to receive the Sacrament in both kinds.* This (you say) *is as little to the purpose as the former, because you do not agree that he did it with an intention, or gave any command that it should be always so received*; but still you are quite besides the business; for that is not our Question, but Whether it be more *safe* to adhere to that which *Christ instituted*, and the *Primitive Church practised*, as you confess yourselves; Or to your *Church*, which prohibits the doing that which you confess *Christ*, and the *Primitive Church* did? and we see how great your *Charity* is, when you *deny a possibility of Salvation to those who assert that Christ's Institution is unalterable, or that all who communicate, are bound to receive in both kinds.* For all other things concerning this Subject, I must refer the Reader to the precedent Chapter, in which they are fully discussed. 4. *The dissenting Churches agree, that in the Eucharists there is sacrifice of Duty, and a sacrifice of Praise, and a sacrifice of Commemoration. Therefore it is safest to hold to the Church of* England *in this, and leave the Church of* Rome *to her Superstitions, that I say no more.* Here you still pretend, *you differ in sense*; but all this is only to say, you assert more than we do; which we grant, but assert upon your Principle, that we are on the safer side. And so in the *intention of the Priest you agree with us as to the necessity of matter and form, and therefore it is safer holding to that, than believing the necessity of the Priest's intention, which many deny.* And if the Rule doth hold, as you assert, That that which both are agreed in, is safer than the contrary; it will hold in matter of Opinion too, that it is safer to believe no more is necessary to the *Sacrament*, than both Parties are agreed in. The last instance is, *That we say, there are divers errors, and some gross ones, in the* Roman *Missal*; *but you confess there is no positive error in the Liturgy of the Church of* England; *and therefore it is safest to worship God by that, and not by the* Roman *Mass.* This you Answer as all the rest, by running off from the business; for, you say, *It cannot be safer to use that, because you Catholicks say, That to use it in contempt of the* Roman *Missals is certainly damnable Sin, and destructive of Salvation.* But as it is not material what you say in this Case, so it is not at all to the purpose; for, if your Rule holds good it must be *safer*; and, if it be not, you must confess the Principle is false, *That what both Parties agree in, is the safest to be chosen in Religion.* The same might be at large proved concerning the main things in difference between us, that, if this Principle be true, we have very much the advantage of you: as, You and we are agreed, that the *Scripture* is *God's Word*, but we deny that *Tradition* is so, therefore it is safer adhering to the *Scripture*, and let *Tradition* shift for itself. You and we are agreed that there are sufficient *Motives* of *Credibility*, to believe the *Scripture*; but we deny that there are any such *Motives* to believe the present *Church's Infallibility*; therefore it is safer to believe the *Scripture*, than the present *Church.* So that this Principle, if improved by these, and other *Instances*, will redound more to our advantage, than yours, considering that in the case we grant it as to you, it is joyned with a *Protestation* of the *extreme hazard* which those run, who venture on your Communion, on the account of it; but there is no such danger upon the agreement with us in those Principles which are agreed upon between us.

P. 317. Ibid. P. 318 P. 306, P. 319. P. 307. P. 320.

§. 9. P. 288. 3. His Lordship answers truly, *that this Proposition, That in Point of Faith and Salvation, 'tis safest for a Man to take that way which the Adversary confesses, or differing Parties agree in, is no Metaphysical Principle, but a bare contingent Proposition, and may be true or false as the matter is to which it is applyed, and so of no necessary truth in itself, nor able to lead in the Conclusion. Because consent of disagreeing Parties, is neither Rule no Proof of Truth.* For Herod *and* Pilate, *disagreeing Parties enough, yet agreed against Truth itself. But Truth rather is, or should be, the Rule to frame, if not to force agreement.* And to prove this further, his Lordship shews, *That if this Principle hold*

P. 308. *good, that 'tis safest to believe as the dissenting Parties agree, or as the adverse party confesses, a Man must be an Heretick in the highest degree, if not an Infidel* For, 1. *In the Question between the Orthodox and Arrian concerning the Consubstantiality of the Son of God with the Father; The Orthodox confessed that which the Arrians asserted,* viz. *that Christ was of a like Nature with his Father; but they added more,* viz. *that he was of the same Nature. Therefore upon this Principle it would be safest holding with the Arrians.* 2. In the Question *about the Resurrection; the dissenting Parties agree, that there ought to be a Resurrection from Sin, to the state of Grace; and that this Resurrection only is meant in divers Passages of Scripture, together with the Life of the Soul, which they are content to say is Immortal; but they deny any Resurrection of the Body after Death. And therefore if this Principle be true, it will be safest to deny the Article of the Resurrection.* 3. In the greatest dispute about *the Unity of the Godhead; all dissenting Parties, Jew, Turk, and Christian, and all sects of Christians, agree in this, That there is but One God; and so by virtue of this Principle, Men will be bound to deny the Trinity.* 4. In the Article of *the Divinity of Christ, The dissenting Parties agree fully and clearly, that Christ is Man; but the Hereticks deny him to be God: if it be therefore safest to go by the consent of dissenting parties, or the confession of Adversaries, it will be safest believing that Christ is a meer*

P. 311. *Man, and not God.* From whence his Lordship most evidently proves, *That this Rule, To resolve a Man's Faith into that, in which the dissenting parties agree, or which the adverse Party confesses, is a meer contingent Proposition, and is as often false as true. And is false in as great, if not greater matters than those, in which it is true. And where it is true, you dare not govern yourselves by it; the Church of* Rome *condemning those things which that Rule proves.* And his Lordship justly admires, *that while you talk of Certainty, nay, of Infallibility, you are driven to make use of such poor shifts as these, which have no Certainty at all of Truth in them, but infer Falshood and Truth alike. And yet for this also, Men will be so weak, or so wilful, as to be seduced by you.* But now it is time to take notice, what Answer you return to these pregnant *In-*

P. 321. *stances* which his Lordship uses; and you think to take of all this by one General Answer, *viz. That the Rule speaks this precisely, and no more,* viz. *that when two Parties differ in one Point of Religion, 'tis in prudence safest to take that way wherein both Parties grant Salvation to be obtainable; but in the former Instances, Salvation was not allowed by the Orthodox to the dissenters.* But, how poor an Evasion this is, will be very easily discovered. For, 1. If that Principle be true, it must be built on that which his Lordship disproves, *viz. That when two Parties disagree, it is safest believing that which both consent in.* For, let any Reasonable Man judge, on what account I ought to make choice of your *Religion*; you say, *Because both Parties are agreed that Men may be saved in your Church*: well then, I ask, Why I ought to believe that which both Parties are agreed in? Doth it not necessarily resolve itself into this Principle, *That it is safest believing that which both Parties consent in?* For if this be not safest, Why should I be more inclined by their consent, than otherwise? So that if you let go this, you let go the only Foundation

on

on which that Principle ſtands. For if the conſenting *parties* may agree in a *falſhood*, What evidence can I have, but that this is one of thoſe *falſhoods* they may agree in? And therefore it is far from being the ſafeſt way to venture upon that which the diſſenting Parties rgree in. And becauſe *Salvation* is a matter of the higheſt moment, If the Principle will not hold as to matter of particular Opinion, much leſs certainly in the moſt weighty Affair of Mens eternal *Salvation*. And it ought to be a ſafe Principle indeed, which Men ſhould venture their Souls upon, and not ſo uncertain *Topical* an Argument as this is. Or that it is ſo far from being a matter of *prudence* to make choice of Religion on ſuch a Principle, that no Man can be guilty of greater Weakneſs or Imprudence, than by doing ſo. 2. If this Principle ſhould be limitted only to a *poſſibility of Salvation*, yet, as to that it is eaſie to diſcover, how falſe and uncertain a Principle it is, becauſe it is generally the nature of *Sects*, to be *uncharitable*, and to deny *Salvation* to all but themſelves: Whereas the Orthodox *Chriſtians* in all Ages have hoped the beſt of thoſe who were miſled among them; and on this ground it would ſtill be ſafer to be on the *Sectaries*, than the *Church's* ſide. You have therefore gained an excellent Principle for the advantage of your *Church*; which, if it hold for you, will hold as well for the moſt *uncharitable Sectaries* that are in the World. Nay, we may go ſomewhat further; and, What think you if *Heatheniſm* itſelf will be proved the ſafeſt way to Salvation? For many of you agree with them, *That many of them might be ſaved, without any explicite Knowledge of Chriſt*; but they deny, *you can be ſaved by it:* If then this Principle be found, farewel the *Church* of *Rome*, and welcome *Philoſophy*. If you ſay, *They are only ſome among you who aſſert the poſſibility of the Salvation of Heathens*; you know, the very ſame Anſwer will hold as to us; you confeſs, *That many Proteſtants grant no more to you than you do to them, in order to Salvation.* If you ſay, *That Heathens may be ſaved only on ſuppoſition of a general Repentance*; that is all that any of us ſay as to you. So that if the Argument will hold one way, it muſt the other too; and it argues, you are very much to ſeek for Proofs, when you make uſe of this to perſwade Men to be of your *Church*. And you have no cauſe to triumph in the Converſion of ſuch, who ſuffer themſelves to be impoſed on by ſo palpable a piece of *Sophiſtry* as this is. But your way is to deal with the weakeſt, and ſuch as are capable of ſuch eaſie *impreſſions* as theſe are. P. 301.

His Lordſhip, from that which was expreſſed, comes to that which was implyed in this Argument, *viz. That we cannot be ſaved, becauſe we are out of the Church.* As to which, he ſaith, *We are out of the Catholick Church, becauſe not within the* Roman. *For the* Roman *Church, and the Church of* England, *are but two diſtinct Members of that Catholick Church, which is ſpread over the face of the Earth. If you can prove, that* Rome *is properly the Catholick Church itſelf, ſpeak out and prove it.* This you ſay, *you have done already*; but, how poorly, let the Reader judge. But, when you add, *That in the day of account, the* Roman *Church will be found not an elder Siſter but a Mother*; it will be well for her, if it prove not, only in the ſenſe wherein *Babylon* the *Great* is called ſo, *viz. The Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.* P. 313. P. 321. Rev. 17. 5.

The Controverſie, you tell us, *goes on touching* Roman-Catholicks *Salvation*, And we muſt follow; though without breaking it into ſeveral *Chapters*, as you do, that ſo we may lay together all that belongs to the ſame Subject. And here his Lordſhip diſtinguiſhes *the Caſe of ſuch, whoſe calling and ſufficiency gives them a greater capacity for underſtanding the Truth*; *and ſuch, whom, as S.* Auguſtin *ſpeaks, the ſimplicity of believing makes ſafe. So that there's no Queſtion* ſaith he, *but many are ſaved in corrupted times of the Church, when their Leaders, unleſs they repented before death, were loſt.* Which he underſtands, *of ſuch* §. 10. P. 222. P. 214.

Leaders,

Leaders, as refuse to hear the Church's instruction, or to use all the means they can to come to the knowledge of the Truth. For if they do this, err they may, but Hereticks they are not; as is most manifest in S. Cyprian's *Case of Re-baptization. But when Leaders add Schism to Heresie, and Obstinacy to both, they are lost without Repentance, while many that succeed them in the Error only without obstinacy may be saved. That is, in case they hold these Errors not supinely, not pertinaciously, not uncharitably, nor factiously*, i.e. *in case all endeavours be used after Truth and Peace, and all expressions of Charity shewed to all who retain an internal Communion with the whole visible Church of Christ in the fundamental points of Faith. Such as these, he confesses to be in a state of Salvation, though their mis-leaders perish.* This is the sum of his Lordships discourse. Which you call, *a heavy Doom*
P. 323. *against all the* Roman *Doctors in general* (for what you say before is a meer declamation and repetition of what hath been often examined.) But you ask, *How could they be all lost, who by the Bishop's own Principles, were members of the true visible Church of Christ, by reason of their being baptized, and holding the Foundation?* But, Doth his Lordship say, that all such as are within the *Church*, are undoubtedly saved? For he only saith, *That no Man can be said simply to be out of the visible Church, that is baptized, and holds the Foundation.* The most then that can be inferred meerly from being within the *Church*, is only, the *possibility* of *Salvation*, notwithstanding which, I suppose you will not deny, but many who have a possibility of Salvation, may yet certainly perish. For many may hold the *Foundation* itself *doctrinally*, who may not hold it *savingly*; and therefore it is a pitiful inference, because he grants they are members of the *Church*, therefore it follows from his Principles, *they cannot be lost.* But you are in a very sad condition, if you have no other ground for your *Salvation*, but being members of that which you account the *Catholick Church.* When *Christ*
John 15. 2 himself saith, *Every branch in me that beareth not Fruit he taketh away*; How much more such, who have nothing else to plead for their *Salvation*, but that they are in the *Church*? It is not therefore the bare *doctrinal* holding that *Faith* which makes them members of the *Church*, which can give them a title to *Salvation:* unless all sincere endeavours be used to find
P. 324. out, what the Will of *God* is, and to practice it when it is known. But, you say, *Your leaders did not refuse the Church's Instructions, for they taught as the Church taught for many hundred years together*; *and, What other means could they be bound to use than they did, to come to the knowledge of the Truth?* Yes, there were other means which they most supinely neglected themselves, and most dangerously with-held from others, *viz. the plain and undoubted Word of God*, which is the only Infallible Rule of Faith. And let any *Church* whatsoever teach against this, it must incurr the same *Anathema* which S. *Paul* pronounces against *an Angel from Heaven*, if he teaches any other Doctrine. Did those then take care of their own, and others Souls, whose greatest care was to *lock* the *Scripture* up from the view of the People, and minded it so little themselves; which yet alone *is able to make Men wise to Salvation.* But you take the greatest advantage of
Ibid. his *vindication* of S. *Cyprian* and his followers, for therein you say, *He vindicates more the* Roman-Catholick *Doctors, who had always the Universal Practice of the Church on their side, which they opposed*; *and condemns Protestants, because, if* S. Cyprian's *followers were in such danger for opposing the whole Church, so must they be too, who, you say, have opposed the Church's Instruction given them by the voice of a general Council.* But, Who is so blind as not to discern that all this proceeds upon a palpable begging the Question, *viz.* that the *whole Church* is of your side, and against us? which I have so often discover'd to be a notorious falshood, that there is no necessi-

ty

ty at all here to repeat it. But, if we grant you that Liberty to ſuppoſe yourſelves to be the *whole and only Church*, you will not more eaſily acquit all your *Doctors*, then condemn *Proteſtants*, both Teachers and People. However, by this we ſee, that you have no other way to do the one, or the other; but by ſuppoſing what you can never prove, and which none in their wits will ever grant you.

The greateſt part of the thirty ſeventh Paragraph in his Lordſhip's Book, is (you ſay) *taken up with Perſonal matters, and matters of Fact, in which you will not interpoſe*; and you might as well have ſpared your Pains in that which you touch, ſince they are ſpent only upon a bare aſſerting the *Greek Church to be guilty of Fundamental Errors* (which we have at large diſproved at the very beginning; but, as his Lordſhip ſays, *you Labour indeed but like a Horſe in a Mill*; *no farther at night than at noon*; *the ſame thing over and over again*; and ſo we find it almoſt to the end of your Book) *and as vain an attempt to clear your Church from any Error endangering Salvation.* For, Whether the Errors of your *Church* be *Fundamental* in themſelves, or only by Reduction and Conſequence; whether you hold all *Fundamental Points* literally, or no; yet if we prove you guilty of any *groſs*, *dangerous*, and *damnable Errors* (as his Lordſhip aſſerts you are) that will be abundantly ſufficient to our purpoſe, that, *Yours cannot poſſibly be any ſafe way to Salvation.* And, although we ſhould grant your *Church* right in the expoſition of the *three Creeds*, yet if you aſſert any other *Errors* of a dangerous nature, your right Expoſition of them cannot ſecure the *Souls* of Men from the *danger* they run themſelves upon, by embracing the other. So much for the Argument drawn from the *poſſibility of Salvation* in the *Roman Church.*

P. 323.

P. 324.

P. 330.

CHAP. V

The Safety of the Proteſtant Faith.

The ſufficiency of the Proteſtant Faith to Salvation manifeſted by diſproving the Cavils againſt it. T. C's. *tedious Repetitions paſſed over. The Argument from Poſſeſſion at large conſider'd. No Preſcription allowable, where the Law hath antecedently determined the Right. Of the Infallibility of Oral Tradition. That, contrary to the received Doctrine of the* Roman *Church; and in itſelf unreaſonable. The Ground of it examined. The ridiculouſneſs of the Plea of bare Poſſeſſion, diſcovered. General Anſwers returned to the remaining Chapters, conſiſting wholly of Things already diſcuſſed. The place of S.* Cyprian *to* Cornelius *particularly vindicated. The proof of Succeſſion of Doctrine lies on the Romaniſts by their own Principles.*

§. 1. ALthough this Subject hath been ſufficiently cleared in the Controverſie concerning the reſolution of Faith; yet the nature of our task requires that we ſo far reſume the debate of it, as any thing undiſcuſſed already offers itſelf to conſideration. For I cannot think it a civil way of treating the Reader, to cloy him with Tautologies, or Repetitions; nor can I think it a way to ſatisfie him, rather by ſome incidental paſſages, than by a full and free Debate. In all thoſe things then, which we have had occaſion to handle already, I ſhall remit the Reader to the precedent Diſcourſes, but whatever hath the face of being new and pertinent, I ſhall readily examine the force of it. The occaſion of this freſh Debate was a new Queſtion of the *Lady*; *Whether ſhe might be ſaved in the Proteſtant Faith?*

In

In answering whereof, you say, *The Parties conferring are put into new heats; Upon my Soul (said the Bishop) you may. Upon my Soul (said Mr.* Fisher*) there's but one saving Faith, and that's the Roman.* Since the confidence seems equal on both sides, we must examine, Which is built on the stronger Reason. And his Lordship's comes first to be examined; which he offers very freely to examination. *For,* saith he, *to believe the Scripture and the Creeds; to believe these in the sense of the Ancient Primitive Church; to receive the four great General Councils so much magnified by Antiquity; to believe all points of Doctrine generally received as fundamental in the Church of Christ, is a Faith, in which to live and dye, cannot but give Salvation. And therefore,* saith he, *I went upon sure ground in the adventure of my Soul upon that Faith. Besides, in all the Points Controverted between us, I would fain see any one Point maintain'd by the Church of* England, *that can be proved to depart from the Foundation. You have many dangerous errors about the very Foundation, in that which you call the* Roman *Faith; but there I leave you to look to your own Soul, and theirs whom you seduce. Thus far his Lordship.* Two things you seem to answer to this. 1. *That such a Faith may not be sufficient,* 2. *That ours is not such a Faith.* 1. *That such a Faith may not be sufficient, because you suppose it necessary to believe the Infallibility of the present Church, and General Councils:* But that we are now excused from a fresh enquiry into; but you would seem to inferr it from his own principles *of submission to General*
P. 328. *Councils.* But by what peculiar Arts you can thence draw, that some thing else is necessary to be believed in order to Salvation besides what hath been owned as Fundamentals in all Ages, I am yet to learn. And sure you were much to seek for Arguments, when you could not distinguish between the necessity of external submission, and internal assent.

§. 2. But the Second is the main thing you quarrel with, *viz. That the English-Protestant Faith is really and indeed such a Faith:* and this you undertake at
P. 329. large to disprove. You ask first, *Whether we believe all Scripture, or only a part of it?* we Answer, All without exception that is *Scripture, i. e.* hath any evidence that ever it was of *Divine Revelation. In this,* you say, *we profess more than we can make good, seeing we refuse many Books owned for Canonical by the Primitive Church, and imbrace some which were not.* But in both you assert that, which we are sure you are never able to defend; since we are content to put it upon as fair a tryal as you can desire, *viz.* That the *Church of England* doth fully agree with the *Primitive Church,* as to the *Canon* of *Scripture.* Which hath been already made good by the successful diligence of a Learned *Bishop* of our *Church,* to whom I refer you either for satisfaction or confusion. But you are the Men whose bare Words and bold affirmations must weigh more than the greatest evidence of Reason or *Antiquity.* You love to Pronounce, where you are loth to prove; and think to bear Men down with Confidence, where you are afraid to enter the Lists. But our Faith stands not on so sandy a Foundation to be blown down with your biggest Words; which have that property of wind in them to be light and loud. When you will attempt to prove that the *Books* call'd *Apocrypha* have had an equal Testimony of Divine Authority with those we receive into the *Canon* of *Scripture,* you may meet with a further Answer upon that Subject. Just as much you say to disprove *our believing Scripture, and the Creeds in the Primitive Church*; For, you say, *The Fathers oppose us,* we deny it: you say, *The Councils condemn us,* we
P. 330. say and prove to the contrary. You offer again at some broken evidences of the *Pope's Supremacy from Councils and Fathers*; but those have been discussed already: and the sense of the *Church* at large manifested to be contrary to it. But I fear your matters lye very ill con-

Bishop *Cosens* Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture.

cocted

coſted upon your ſtomach, you bring them us ſo often up; but I am not bound to dance in a *Circle* becauſe you do ſo. And therefore I proceed; but when I hope to do ſo, you pull me back again to the *Infallibility of Councils* P. 331. and the *Church*, the queſtion of *Fundamentals* and the *Greek Church*; and P. 332. ſcarce a page between, but in comes again the *Pope's Supremacy* as freſh, as if it had been never handled before. But I aſſure you after this rate, I wonder P. 334. you ever came to an end, for you might have writ all your life-time after P. 335. that manner. For the *decretal Epiſtles* (thoſe impregnable teſtimonies) S. *Cyprian*, *Optatus*, *Hierom*, *Auſtin*, *the Council of Sardica*, *Epheſus*, *Chalcedon*, and all the baffled and impertinent proofs you think on, muſt be preſſed to do new ſervice, though they had run out of the *Field* before. And this you call a General Conſent of the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*; but I muſt beg the Reader not to be ſcared with theſe *vizards*, for if he touches them they fall off, and then you will ſee them bluſh that they are ſo often abuſed to ſo ill an end. But this is not the only ſubject (*viz.* the *Pope's Supremacy*) which you give us ſo often over, but, within a Page or two following, P. 337. *enter* again *worſhip* of *Images* with as much ceremony as if it had never appeared; but till you have Anſwered what I have ſaid already, all that P. 338. you have here is vain and impertinent: in the next Page *enter Tranſubſtantiation*: P. 339. in the following, *enter* again *Infallibility* of *Councils*, *Reſolution of Faith*, *Apocrypha Books*, *Fundamentals*, *Communion in one kind*, &c. to the end of the Chapter. In all which I find but two things new, the one about *Purgatory*, which we ſhall meet with again; and the other you call a *Note* only by the way, but it is ſo rare a one, it ought to be con- P. 333. ſidered.

Which is, *That Proteſtants ought to prove their Faith agreeable to that of the Primitive Church by ſpecial undeniable evidence*; *but they have not the like reaſon to require it of you Catholicks* (good reaſon for it) *but*, you ſay, *not that you are unable to do it*, (no, who would ever ſuſpect that, who reads your Book?) *but becauſe you are in full and quiet poſſeſſion of your Faith, Religion, Church*, &c. *by immemorial tradition and ſucceſſion from your Anceſtors, that you do, upon that ſole ground of quiet poſſeſſion, juſtly preſcribe againſt your Adverſaries. And your Plea*, you ſay, *muſt in all Law and Equity be admitted for good, till they do by more Pregnant and Convincing Arguments diſprove it, and ſhew that your poſſeſſion is not* bonæ fidei, *but gain'd by Force or Fraud, or ſome other wrongful and unallowed means.* To this, becauſe I have not yet conſidered it, I ſhall now return the fuller Anſwer. And it appears that the proof lyes upon you: For they who challenge *full and quiet poſſeſſion* by vertue of *immemorial tradition* and *ſucceſſion* from their *Anceſtors*, ought to produce the conveyance of that *tradition* from him who alone could inveſt them in that poſſeſſion. For although this title of *poſſeſſion* be of late ſo much inſiſted on by thoſe who ſee the weakneſs of other Arguments and are aſhamed to uſe them, yet whoſoever throughly ſearches it, will find it as weak and ridiculous as any other. For it is plain in this caſe, the full *right* depends not upon meer *occupancy*, but a *title* muſt be pleaded, to ſhew that the poſſeſſion is *bonæ fidei*; ſo that the Queſtion comes from the bare *poſſeſſion* to the *goodneſs* of the title and the validity of it in juſtice and equity. Your title then is *immemorial tradition* from your *Anceſtors*: but here ſeveral things are to be *conteſted*, before your *preſcription* be allowed, 1. That no *antecedent Law* hath determin'd contrary to what you challenge by vertue of *poſſeſſion*. For if it hath, no *preſcription* is allowable in it. For, *preſcription* can only take place where the *Law* allows a liberty for *preſcription*; but if the *Law* hath antecedently determin'd againſt it, *poſſeſſion* ſignifies nothing, but the §. 3.

Liberty to make good the *Title*. Would any Man be so mad, as to think that *prescription* of threescore years would have been sufficient in the *Judaical Law*, when all possessions were to return to their first Owners by *Law*, at every year of *Jubilee*? So then the Matter to be enquired here, is What Liberty of *prescripions* is allowed by virtue of the *Law* of *Christ*; for since he hath made *Laws* to Govern his *Church* by, it is most senseless pleading *prescription*, till you have particularly examin'd, how far such *prescription* is allowed by him. Let us then suppose, that any of the Matters in difference between us, are one way or other determined by him, *viz.* Whether the *Bishop of Rome* be Head of the *Church* or no, Whether the present *Church* be *Infallible* or no. What do you say? Hath he determined these things, or hath he not? If he hath determined them one way or other, it is to no purpose in the World to plead *possession* or *prescription*; for these signifie nothing against *Law*. So that the Question must be wholly removed from the *Plea* of *possession*, and it must be tryed upon this *issue*, whether *Christ* by his *Law* hath determined on your side or ours? It may be you will tell me, *That in this Case prescription interprets Law, and that the Church's Possession argues it was the will of Christ*. But still the proof lyes upon your side, since you run yourself into new bryars; for you must prove that there is no way to interpret this *Law*, but by the practice of the *Church*, and which is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of all, That the *Church* cannot come into the possession of any thing, but what was originally given her by the *Legislator*. Which is a task necessarily incumbent on you to prove, and I suppose you will find so much difficulty in it, that you had as good run back to *Super hanc Petram*, and *Pasce oves*, as undertake to manage it. He that undertakes to prove it impossible that the *Church* should claim *possession* by an undue title; must prove it impossible, that the *Church* should ever be deceived. And herein we see the excellent way of this proof. For suppose the matter in dispute be the *Roman Church's Infallibility*, *this*, you say, *you are in possession* of (though that be the thing in question), well, we will suppose it, that we may discern your proofs. I demand then, On what account do you challenge this? you say, *By prescription*. I further ask, How you prove this *prescription* sufficient? you say, *Because the Church cannot challenge any thing but what belongs to her*. I demand the proof of that: your Answer must be, *Because the Church cannot be deceived*; so that the proof at last comes to this, *The Church is Infallible because she is Infallible*.

§. 4. Well, but suppose this *Infallibility* challenged, be only an *Infallibility* of *Tradition* and not a *Doctrinal Infallibility* in either *Pope* or *Councils*; Yet still I am unsatisfied as ever. For I ask, Whether am I bound to believe what the present Church delivers to be Infallible? *Yes*. On what account am I bound to believe it? *Because the present Church cannot be deceived in what the Church of the former Age believed, nor that in the preceding, and so up till the time of Christ*. But, 1. How can you assure me, the present *Church* obliges me to believe nothing, but only *what, and so far*, as it received it from the former *Church*? What evidence can you bring to convince me, both that the *Church* alway observed this *Rule*, and could never be deceived in it? For I see the *Roman Church* asserts, that things may be *de fide* in one Age, which were not in another; at least *Popes, and Councils* challenge this, and this is the common Doctrine maintained there, and others are looked on as no Members of their *Church* who assert the contrary; but as Persons, at least, *meritoriously*, if not *actually*, excommunicate. Where then shall I satisfie myself what the sense of your *Church* is, as to this particular? Must I believe a very few Persons whom the rest disown as

Heretical

Heretical and Seditious Perſons? or ought I not rather to take the judgment of the greateſt and moſt approv'd in that *Church?* And theſe diſown any ſuch Doctrine; but aſſert that the *Church* may determine things *de fide* which were not ſo before: In which Caſe I ask, Whether, when a thing is *de novo* determined to be *de fide*, that *Church* believed as the precedent did, or no? If it did, How comes any thing to be *de fide*, which was not before? If it did not, What aſſurance can I have that every Age of the *Church* believes juſt as the *precedent* did, and no otherwiſe? when I ſee they profeſs the contrary. And if a thing may be *de fide* in one age, which was not in a forgoing, then a *Church* may deliver that as a matter of Faith at one time, which was never accounted ſo before: by which means the preſent *Church* may oblige me to believe that as a matter of *Faith* which never was ſo in *Chriſt*, or the *Apoſtles* times, and ſo the *Infallibility* on the account of *Tradition* is deſtroyed. 2. What ſecurity is there, that in no age of the *Church* any practices ſhould come in, which were not uſed in the precedent? You may ſay, *Becauſe they could not be deceived what their fore-Fathers did:* but that ſatisfies not, unleſs you prove that all the *Church* in every Age look'd upon itſelf as oblig'd to do nothing at all, but what their *Fore-fathers* did. For although they might know never ſo much what was done by them, if they did not judge themſelves bound to obſerve unalterably what they did, this doth not hinder at all, but new *cuſtoms* and opinions might be introduced in the *Church*. And therefore I cannot but juſtly wonder, that any Men of parts who profeſſedly diſown the vulgar ways of eſtabliſhing the *Roman Church* ſhould think to ſatisfie themſelves with *Oral Tradition*, and cry it up as ſo impregnable a thing. *Becauſe no Age of the Church can be deceived in what the foregoing did and taught.* Whereas a very little of that reaſon, which theſe Men pretend to, might acquaint them, that the *force* of it doth not lye in their *capacity* to know what was done by others, but in their *obligation* not to vary at all from it. For the main weight of the Argument lyes here, *That nothing hath been changed in the Faith or Practice of the Church*, which being the thing to be proved, the bare knowledge of what was believed or practiſed, is not ſufficient to prove it; for Men may know very well what others believe and do, and yet may believe and do quite contrary themſelves. But the only thing to be proved in this Caſe is, That every age of the *Church*, and all Perſons in it look'd upon themſelves as obliged, not to vary in any thing from the Doctrine or practice of the precedent age. And I pray let me know by what demonſtrative *medium* can this be prov'd; for no leſs than *demonſtrations* are ſpoken of by the magnifiers of this way; although there be ſo little evidence in it, that it cannot work but upon a very weak underſtanding. Muſt that *obligation*, to obſerve all which the *precedent Age* believed or practiſed be proved by *reaſon*, *particular Teſtimony*, or *univerſal Tradition*? And let the Extollers of this way take their choice, ſo they will undertake to bring Evidence equal to the weight which depends upon it. It is hard to conceive what *Reaſon* ſhould inforce it, but ſuch as proves the impoſſibility of the contrary: And they have *underſtandings* of another *mould* from others, who can conceive it impoſſible that Men ſhould not think themſelves *obliged* to *believe* and do all juſt as their Predeceſſors did. If *particular Teſtimonies* could be produced, they ſignifie no more, than their own Judgments; but we are enquiring for the Judgment of every age of the *Church*, and the Perſons who lived in it. And to prove an *univerſal Tradition* of this *obligation* is the moſt difficult task of all, for it depends upon the truth of that which is to be proved by it. For if they did not think themſelves *obliged* to believe and do what their Predeceſſors did, they could not think themſelves bound to deliver ſuch an *obligation* to their

poſterity to do it. And therefore you muſt firſt prove the *obligation* itſelf, before you can prove the *univerſal tradition* of it. For although one Age may deliver it, yet you cannot be aſſured that a former Age did it to them; unleſs you can prove, the ſame ſenſe of this *obligation* ran through them all. But this is ſo far from being an *univerſal tradition*, that the preſent Age from which it begins was never agreed in it, as I have ſhewed already.

§. 5. 3. It is to no purpoſe to prove the *impoſſibility* of *motion*, when I ſee Men move: no more it is to prove that no *age* of the *Church* could vary from the foregoing, when we can evidently prove that they have done it. And therefore this Argument is intended only to *catch* eaſie minds that care not for a ſearch into the Hiſtory of the ſeveral *ages* of the *Church*, but had rather ſit down with a ſuperficial ſubtilty than ſpend time in further enquires. For this Argument proceeds juſt as if men ſhould prove the world *eternal* by this *medium*; The preſent Age ſees no alteration in it, and they could not be deceived in what their Fore-fathers believed, nor they in theirs, and ſo on *in infinitum*; for no Man did ever ſee the World made: and therefore it was never made, and ſo eternal. But if we go about to prove by Reaſon the production of the *world*, or by *Scripture* to ſhew that it was once made, then this *oral tradition* is ſpoiled. And ſo it is in the preſent caſe; Theſe Men attempt to prove there could never be any alteration in the Faith or Practice of the *Church* ſince *Chriſt's* time; *for the preſent age delivers what it had from the precedent, and ſo up till the firſt inſtitution of the Church:* but in the mean time, if we can evidently prove that there hath been ſuch alterations in the *Church*, then it is to no purpoſe to prove that impoſſible which we ſee actually done. And this appears, not only becauſe the *Scripture* ſuppoſes a *degeneracy* in the Chriſtian *Church*, which could never be, if every Age of the *Church* did infallibly *believe* and *practiſe* as the precedent up to *Chriſt's* time did; but becauſe we can produce clear evidence, that ſome things are delivered by the preſent *Church* which muſt be brought in by ſome Age ſince the Time of *Chriſt*. For which I ſhall referr you to what I have ſaid already concerning *Communion in one kind*, *Invocation of Saints*, *and Worſhip of Images*. In all which I proved evidently, that they were not in *uſe* in ſome Ages of the *Chriſtian Church*; and it is as evident that theſe are delivered by the preſent *Church*; and therefore this Principle muſt needs be falſe. For by theſe things it appears, that one *age* of the *Church* may differ in Practice or Opinion from another, and therefore this *oral Tradition* cannot be infallible. And yet this is the only way whereby a *preſcription* may be allowed, for this offers to give a ſufficient *title* if it could be made good. But *bare poſſeſſion* in matters of Religion is a moſt ſenſeleſs Plea; and which would juſtifie *Heatheniſm* and *Mahumatiſm* as well as your *Church*.

§. 6. 2. It were worth knowing, What you mean *by full and quiet poſſeſſion of your Faith, Religion, and Church, which you ſay you were in.* Either you mean that you did believe the Doctrines of your *Church* yourſelves, or that we were bound to believe them too. If you mean only the former, you are in as full *poſſeſſion* of them as ever, for I ſuppoſe all in your *Church* do believe them; if you intend by this *poſſeſſion*, that we ought to *believe* them becauſe you did, this is a *preſcription* indeed, but without any ground or reaſon. For even *Tertullian* whom you cite for *preſcribing* againſt *Hereticks*, ſays, *That nothing can be preſcribed againſt Truth*, Non ſpatium temporum, non patrocinia perſonarum, non privilegium regionum. *Neither length of time, nor Authority of Perſons, nor priviledge of places.* If you ſay, *It was Truth you were in poſſeſſion of*, this is the thing to be proved; and if you can make that appear we will not diſturb your *poſſeſſion* at all. But you muſt be ſure to

Tertul. de virg. veland. cap. 1.

prove

prove it by ſomething elſe beſides your *quiet and full poſſeſſion*; unleſs you can prove it impoſſible that you ſhould be poſſeſſed of falſhoods; But we have evidently ſhewn the contrary already. And if we examine a little further what this *poſſeſſion is*, we ſhall ſee what an excellent *right* it gives you to preſcribe by. You were poſſeſſed of your *Faith*, *Religion*, and *Church*, *i.e.* you did believe the *Roman Church infallible*, you believed the *Pope's Supremacy*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* And what then? Do you not believe them ſtill? Yes doubtleſs. But, What is your quarrel with us then? Do we hinder you the *Poſſeſſion* of them? *No*, *but we ought to believe them too.* But, Why ſo? *becauſe you are in poſſeſſion of them.* What, Muſt we than believe whatever you do, whether it be true or falſe? If this be the meaning of your *Poſſeſſion*, you ought well to prove it, or elſe we ſhall call it *Uſurpation.* For it is a moſt ridiculous thing for you to talk of *Poſſeſſion*, when the Queſtion is, Whether there be any ſuch things in the World or no, as thoſe you ſay you are poſſeſſed of? We deny your *Church's Infallibility*, the *Pope's Supremacy*, *Purgatory*, *&c.* You muſt firſt prove there are ſuch things *in rerum naturâ*, as *Purgatory*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *&c.* before you can ſay, you are *poſſeſſed of them:* You muſt convince us, that your *Church* is *Infallible*, and that the *Pope* was made *Head* of the *Church by Chriſt*, and then we will grant you are in full poſſeſſion of them, but not before. So that you ſee, the Queſtion is not concerning the manner of *Poſſeſſion*, but of the things themſelves, which you call your *Faith*, *Religion*, and *Church*, in oppoſition to ours; and therefore it is impoſſible to plead *Preſcription*, where there never was any *Poſſeſſion* at all. And therefore you clearly miſtake when you call us, *The Agreſſors*, for you are plainly the *Impoſers* in this Caſe, and quarrel with us for not believing what you would have us; and therefore you are bound to prove, and not we. So that there is nothing you could challenge any *Poſſeſſion* of in the *Church* of *England*, but ſome *Authority* which the *Pope* had, which you elſewhere confeſs *he might be deprived of*, *as he was in King* Henry's *time*; and which we offer to prove that he was not *Poſſeſſer bonæ fidei* of, but that he came to it by *fraud* and *violence*, and was deprived of it by a *legal Power*. Thus I have fully examined your Argument from *Poſſeſſion*, becauſe it preſents us with ſomething which had not been diſcuſſed before.

§. 7. But having taken a view of all that remains, I find that it conſiſts of a bare Repetition of the Controverſies before diſcuſſed, eſpecially concerning the *certainty* and *grounds of Faith*, the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and *General Councils*, and the *Authority* of the *Roman Church*; So that if you had not an excellent faculty of ſaying moſt, where there is leaſt occaſion, I ſhould wonder at your deſign in ſpending ſeveral *Chapters* in giving the ſame things, under other words. Unleſs it were an ambition of anſwering every clauſe in his Lordſhips Book, which carry'd you to it, though you only gave over and over what you had ſaid in many places before; which is a piece of *vanity* I neither envy you for, nor ſhall I ſtrive to imitate you in; having made it my endeavour to lay thoſe grounds in the handling each Controverſie, that there ſhould not need any ſuch fruitleſs repetitions as you here give us. His Lordſhip, though he complains much of it, was forced by his *Adverſaries* importunity to return the ſame Anſwers in effect, which had been given before by him in the proper places; but, whoſoever compares what his Lordſhip ſaith, with what you pretend to anſwer, will find no neceſſity at all of my undergoing the ſame tedious and weariſome task. Inſtead therefore of a particular Anſwer, I ſhall give only ſome *general ſtrictures* on what remains of theſe Subjects, where there is any appearance of difficulty

difficulty; and conclude all with the examination of your *Defence* of *Purgatory*, that being a Subject which hath not yet come under our enquiry. Your main buſineſs is to perſwade us, *that yours is the only ſaving Faith*; which
P. 340. you prove by this, *The ſaving Faith is but one, yours is confeſſed by us to be a ſaving Faith ſtill; therefore yours is the only ſaving Faith.* But if you had conſidered on what that confeſſion depends, you could have made no Argument at all of it; for, when we ſay, that your *Faith* is *ſaving*, we mean no more but this, that you have ſo much of the common truths of *Chriſtianity* among you, that there is a poſſibility for Men to be ſaved in your *Church*; but, Doth this imply, that yours is a *ſaving Faith*, in that ſenſe wherein it is ſaid, There is but one *ſaving Faith*? for in that Propoſition it is underſtood of all thoſe common fundamental Truths, which the *Chriſtian Church* of all Ages hath been agreed in. And the ſaying, There is but *one ſaving Faith*, is of the ſame ſenſe with the ſaying, There is but *one true Religion* in the World.

The ſubſtance of what you would inferr from the ſaying of *Athanaſius*'s
P. 351. *Creed, Which if a Man keeps whole and inviolate* (as you would have it) is this *That a Man is equally bound to believe every Article of Faith.* But you cannot mean, that it is ſimply neceſſary to do it, for that you diſclaim elſewhere, by your diſtinction of *things neceſſary from the matter and the formal Reaſon of Faith*; and therefore it can only be meant of ſuch to whom thoſe *objects* of *Faith* are ſufficiently propoſed, and ſo far we acknowledge it too, that it is neceſſary to Salvation for every Man to believe that which he is convinced to be an object of Faith. For otherwiſe ſuch Perſons muſt call in queſtion *God's Veracity*; but if you would hence make it neceſſary to believe all that your *Church* propoſes for matter of *Faith*, you muſt prove, that whatever your *Church* delivers, is as infallibly true, as if *God* himſelf ſpake; and when you can perſwade us of this, we ſhall believe whatever is propounded by
P. 352. her. When you ſay, *We cannot believe all Articles of Faith on the ſame formal Reaſon, becauſe we deny the Church's Infallibility*, it is apparent, that you make the *Church's* Teſtimony the *formal Reaſon* of Faith; and that you are bound to prove the *Church* abſolutely *Infallible*, before we can believe any thing
P. 353. on her account. Neither doth it follow, *Becauſe we deny that, therefore we pick and chuſe our Faith*; for we believe all without reſervation, which you, or any Man can convince us was ever revealed by *God*. As to what at large occurs here again, about the *Infallibility of Councils*; there is nothing
P. 355. &c. but what hath been ſufficiently anſwered on that ſubject; and ſo reſerving the Queſtion of *Purgatory*, which is here brought in by his Lordſhip, as a further Inſtance of the Errors of *General Councils*; I paſs on to the two laſt
P. 373. Chapters: In which we meet again with the objected inconveniencies, *from*
P. 376, &c. *queſtioning the Infallibility of the Church and Councils, That then Faith would be uncertain, and private Perſons might judge of Councils, and if they may err in one, they may err in all*; as freſh as if they had never been heard of before. Only
P. 375. the Argument from *Rom.* 10. 15. *That becauſe none can preach except they*
P. 386. *be ſent, therefore the preſent Church is infallible*, is both new and excellent, on which account I let it paſs. If your *Church*, with all her *Infallibility*, can do no more, as you confeſs, in reference to *Hereſies, but only ſecure the faithful members of the Church, who have due care of themſelves, and perform their duty well towards their lawful Paſtors*; you have little cauſe to boaſt of the great priviledge of it, and as little Reaſon to contend for the neceſſity of it, ſince ſo much is done without it, and on ſurer grounds by the *Scriptures*, and the uſe of other means which fall ſhort of *Infallibility*.

§. 8. In the beginning of your laſt *Chapter*, we have a large diſpute concerning S. *Cyprian*'s meaning, in his 45*th Epiſtle* to *Cornelius*, where he ſpeaks *of*

the

the root and matrix of the Catholick Church, viz. Whether by that, the *Roman Church* be understood or no? His Lordship saith, *Not*, and gives many Reasons for it; you maintain the contrary; but the business may be soon decided upon a true state of the occasion of writing that *Epistle*. Which in short was this; It seems, Letters had been sent in the Name of *Polycarp Bishop* of the *Colony* of *Adrumyttium*, directed to *Cornelius* at *Rome*; but *Cyprian* and *Liberalis* coming thither, and acquainting the *Clergy* there with the Resolution of the *African Bishops* to suspend Communion either with *Cornelius*, or *Novatianus*, till the return of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, who were sent on purpose to give an account of the proceedings there, the *Clergy* of *Adrumyttium* upon this writing to *Rome*, direct their Letters not to *Cornelius*, but to the *Roman Clergy*. Which *Cornelius* (being it seems informed by some, as though it were done by S. *Cyprian's Council*) takes offence at, and writes to *Cyprian* about it. Who gives him in this *Epistle* the Account of it, that it was only done, that there might be no dissent among themselves upon this difference at *Rome*, and that they only suspended their Sentence till the return of *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, who might either bring them Word that all was composed at *Rome*, or else satisfie them, who was the Lawfully ordained *Bishop*. And therefore, as soon as they understood that *Cornelius* was the lawful *Bishop*, they unanimously declare for him, and order all Letters to be sent to him, and that his Communion should be embraced. This is the substance of that *Epistle*. But, it seems *Cornelius* was moved at S. *Cyprian*'s suspending himself, as though it were done out of dis-favour to him; which *Cyprian* to clear himself of, tells him, That his design was only to preserve the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. *For*, saith he, *we give this Advice to all those who the mean time had occasion to sail to* Rome, ut Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem & matricem agnoscerent & tenerent; *that they would acknowledge and hold to the Root and Matrix of the Catholick Church*, by which his Lordship understands, *the Unity of the Church Catholick*; you, *the particular Church of* Rome. But it is apparent, the meaning of this *Councel* was, to prevent their participation in the *Schism*. So that if, upon their coming to *Rome*, the *Schismatical* party was evidently known from the other (which they might, I grant, soon understand there, by the circumstances of Affairs) they should joyn themselves with that *part* which preserved the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. Which I take to be the true meaning of S. *Cyprian*. But in case the matter should prove disputable at *Rome*, and the matter be referred to other *Churches*, then by virtue of this Advice, they were bound to suspend their Communion with either Party, till the *Catholick Church* had declar'd itself. By this account of the business, all your Arguments come to nothing; for they only prove that which I grant, *viz. That in case it appeared at* Rome, *which was the Catholick Party, they were to Communicate with it*: but this was not, because the *Catholick Party* at *Rome* was the *Root* and *Matrix* of the *Catholick Church* (for on that Account the Party of *Novatianus* might have been so too, if *Novatianus* had been lawful *Bishop*) but their holding to the *Root* of the *Catholick Church*, would oblige them to Communicate only with that *part*, which did preserve the *Unity* of it. For the Controversie now at *Rome* was between two *Parties* both challenging an equal *Right*; and therefore if S. *Cyprian* had only advised them to Communicate with the *Roman Church*, because that was the *Root* and *Matrix* of the *Catholick Church*, his Advice had signified nothing; for the Question was not between the *Church* of *Rome*, and other *Churches*, in which case it might have been pertinent to have said, they should adhere to the *Church* of *Rome*, because that

P. 391.
P. 392.

that was the *Root*, *&c.* But when the difference was at *Rome*, between two *Bishops* there, this Reason had been wholly impertinent; for the only Reason proper in this case, must be such as must *discriminate* the one *Party* from the other, which this could not do, because it was equally challenged by them both. And had belonged to one as well as the other, in case *Novatianus* had proved the lawful *Bishop*, and not *Cornelius*. And therefore the sense of *Cyprian*'s words must be such as might give direction which party to joyn with at *Rome*, on which account they cannot import any priviledge of the *Church* of *Rome* over other *Churches*, but only contain this advice, that they should hold to the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, and communicate only with that *party* which did it. This Reason is so clear and evident to me, that this place cannot be understood of any *priviledge* of the *Church* of *Rome*, above other *Churches*, that if there were nothing else to induce me to believe it, this were so pregnant, that I could not resist the force of it.

§. 9. P. 366. But besides this, his Lordship proves, that elsewhere S. *Cyprian* speaks in his own Person with other *Catholick Bishops*, *nos qui Ecclesiæ unius caput & radicem tenemus*, *we who hold the Head and Root of one Church*, by which it appears, he could not make the *Church* of *Rome* the *Root and Matrix of the Catholick*; this being understood of the *Unity and Society of the Catholick Church*, *Cypr. p. 73.* without relation to the *Church* of *Rome:* and S. *Cyprian* writes to *Cornelius*, that they had sent *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* to reduce the *Church* of *Rome* to the *Unity* and *Communon* of the *Catholick Church*; and because no particular *Church* can be the *Root* of the *Catholick*, and if any where, *Jerusalem* might more pretend to it than *Rome*, and because S. *Cyprian* and his *Brethren* durst not have suspended their Communion at all, if they had looked on the *Church* of *Rome*, as the *Root and Matrix of the Catholick*, as *Baronius* confesses they did, all which things are largely insisted on by his Lordship, and do all confirm, that hereby was not meant any Authority or Priviledge of the *Church* of *Rome* above other *Apostolical Churches*, which in respect of the lesser *Churches* which came from them, are called *Matrices Ecclesiæ*, by *Tertullian* and others. But you are still so very unreasonable, that though no more be said of the *Church* of *Rome*, than might be said of any other *Apostolical Church*, yet because it is said of the *Church* of *Rome*, it must import some huge Authority, which if it had been said of any other, would have been interpreted by yourselves into nothing: For so do you deal with us here; for, because it is said, that they who joyned with *Cornelius*, did preserve the Unity of the *Catholick Church*, therefore it must needs be understood, that P. 394. the *Roman Church* is the *Root* of the *Catholick*. But he must have a very mean understanding, that can be swayed by such trifles as these are: For, was there not a *Catholick* and *Schismatical* party then at *Rome*? and if they who joyned with *Novatianus*, did separate from the *Catholick Church*, then they who were in Communion with *Cornelius*, must preserve the *Unity* of it. And, Would not this Argument as well prove the *Catholick* party at *Carthage* to be the *Root* and *matrix* of the *Catholick Church*, as at *Rome*? But such kind of things must they deal with, who are resolved to maintain a cause, and yet are destitute of better means to do it with. So that I cannot find any thing in all your Answer, but what would equally hold for any other *Church* at that time, which was so divided as *Rome* was; considering the great care that then was used to preserve the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*. *Part 2. ch. 2. sect. 8, 9,* And what particularly S. *Cyprian*'s apprehension was concerning the *Nature* and *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, we have at large discoursed already, to which place we referr the Reader, if he desires any further satisfaction.

Your

Your whole N. 5. depends on perſonal matters concerning the *ſatisfaction* of the *Lady's Conſcience*; but if you would thence inferr, *That ſhe did well to deſert the Proteſtant Communion*; you muſt prove that it can be no ſin to follow the dictates of an erronious Conſcience. For ſuch, we ſay, it was in her, and, you denying it, all this Diſcourſe ſignifies nothing, but depends on the truth of the matters in controverſie between us. But you moſt notoriouſly impoſe on his Lordſhip, when, becauſe he aſſerts *the poſſibility of Salvation of ſome in your Church*, you would make him ſay, That it is no ſin to joyn with your *Church*: You might as well ſay, Becauſe he hopes ſome who have committed *Adultery* may be ſaved, therefore it is no *ſin* to commit Adultery. So that while you are charging him *falſly* for allowing diſſimulation, you do that which is more, in ſaying that which you cannot but know to be a great untruth. §. 10. P. 399, &c. P. 401.

If *our Religion be not the ſame with yours*, as you eagerly contend it is not, let it ſuffice to tell you, That our *Religion* is *Chriſtianity*, let yours be what it will. And if it pleaſe you better, to have a name wholly diſtinct from us, yours ſhall be called the *Roman Religion*, and ours the *Chriſtian*. If you judge us *of another Religion from yours, becauſe we do not believe all that you do*, we may judge you to have a different Religion from the *Chriſtian*, becauſe you impoſe more by your own confeſſion to be believed as neceſſary in order to Salvation, than ever *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles* did. And certainly the main of any *Religion* conſiſts in thoſe things which are neceſſary to be believed in it, in order to Eternal Happineſs. P. 402.

In your following Diſcourſe, you are ſo far from giving us *any hopes of peace with your Church*, that you plainly give us the reaſon, why it is vain to expect or deſire it; which is, That if your *Church* ſhould recede from any thing, it would appear ſhe had erred, and if that appears, farewel *Infallibility*; and then if that be once gone, you think all is gone. And while you maintain it, we are ſo far from hoping any peace with you, that the *Peace* of *Chriſtendom* may ſtill be joyned in the *Dutchman's* Sign with the *quadrature* of the *Circle*, and the *Philoſophers Stone*, for the *ſign* of the *three hopeleſs things*. P. 403.

How far we are bound *to ſubmit to General Councils*, hath been ſo fully cleared already, that I need not go about here to vindicate his Lordſhip's Opinion from falſity or contradiction; both which you unreaſonably charge it with, and that ſtill from no wiſer a ground, than not being able to diſtinguiſh between the ſubmiſſion of *Obedience* and *Faith*. For his Lordſhip ſaith, *It may be our duty not to oppoſe General Councils in caſe they err, and yet it may be no pride not to believe known and groſs Errors of General Councils*; and I pray, What ſhadow of a contradiction; is here? And if it be pride in us not to believe groſs Errors impoſed on us, Is it not much more intolerable in them who offer to impoſe them? What Authority the *Pope* hath either to order or confirm *Councils*, it is not here a place to enter upon again, ſince it hath been ſo largely Diſcourſed of in ſo many places. But you force me, though not to the repetition of matter, yet to the repeating my ſaying that I will not, oftener than I ſhould, but only to ſhew, how little you deſerve any further Anſwer. P. 404. &c. P. 406.

There is nothing now remaining to the end of your *Book*, which hath not been over and over, even in theſe *laſt Chapters*, but only a long diſcourſe touching *Succeſſion*, which you ſhew yourſelf, of how little importance it is, when, after you have endeavoured at large to prove the neceſſity of *Perſonal Succeſſion*, you grant, *That it is not ſufficient without Succeſſion of Doctrine too*: And on that Account you deny the *Greek Church* to have a true P. 409. P. 410.

P. 411. *Succession.* And in vindication of *Stapleton*, you say, *All the Succession which he and you contend for, is a Succession of Pastors, which hold entire both the Unity and the Faith of the Church.* So that it comes to this at last, that you are bound to prove a continual *Succession* of all that which you call the Faith of your *Church* in every Age from the *Apostles* time; if you would have us believe that Doctrine, or own your *Church* for the true *Church* of *Christ*. And therefore I conclude these general Answers with his Lordships words;

P. 382. *If* A. C. T. C. *or any Jesuit can prove, that by a visible continued Succession from Christ or his Apostles to this Day, either Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, or the Eucharist in one kind, or Purgatory, or Worship of Images, or the Intention of the Priest of necessity in Baptism, or the Power of the Pope over a General Council, or his Infallibility with or without it, or his Power to depose Princes, or the publick prayers of the Church in an unknown Tongue, with divers other Points have been so taught; I, for my part, will give the Cause.*

CHAP. VI.

The Sense of the Fathers concerning Purgatory.

The Advantage which comes to the Church of Rome, *by the Doctrine of Purgatory, thence the boldness of our Adversaries in contending for it. The Sense of the* Roman *Church concerning Purgatory, explained. The Controversie between the Greek and Latin Church concerning it. The Difference in the Church of* Rome *about Purgatory. Some general Considerations about the Sense of the Fathers, as to its being an Article of Faith. The Doubtfulness and Uncertainty of the Fathers Judgments in this particular, manifested by S.* Austin *the first who seemed to assert a Purgation before the Day of Judgment. Prayer for the Dead used in the Ancient Church, doth not infer Purgatory. The Primate of* Armagh *vindicated from our Adversaries Calumnies. The general Intention of the Church distinguished from the private Opinions of particular Persons. The Prayers of the Church respected the Day of Judgment. The Testimonies of the Fathers in behalf of Purgatory, examined; particularly of the pretended* Dionysius, Tertullian, *S.* Cyprian, Origen, *S.* Ambrose, *S.* Hierom, *S.* Basil, Nazianzen, Lanctantius, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, &c. *And not one of them asserts the Purgatory of the Church of* Rome, *S.* Austin *doth not contradict himself about it. The Doctrine of Purgatory no elder than* Gregory I. *and built on Credulity and Superstition. The Church's Infallibility made at last the Foundation of the belief of Purgatory. The Falsity of that Principle: and the whole concluded.*

§. 1. THese general Answers being dispatched, there remains only now this Question concerning *Purgatory* to be discussed. Which being the great *Diana* of your *Church*, no wonder you are so much displeased at his Lordship for speaking against it; for by that means *your Craft is in danger to be set at nought.* There being no Opinion in your *Church* which brings in a more constant Revenue, by *Masses for the Dead*, and *Indulgences*, besides *Casualties*, and *Deodands*, by dying Persons, or their Friends, in hopes of a speedier release out of the pains of *Purgatory*. So that if this Opinion were once out of *Countenance* in the World, you would lose one of the best Arts you have of upholding the *Grandeur* of your *Church*. For then farewel *Indulgences*, and years of *Jubilee*; farewel all those rich *Donations* which are given by those at their death, who hope by that means to

get

get the ſooner out of the *Suburbs* of *Hell*, to a place of reſt and Happineſs. For, What Engine could poſſibly be better contrived to exhort the largeſt gifts from thoſe whoſe Riches were as great as their Sins, than to perſwade them, that by that means they would be ſooner delivered out of the *Flames* of *Purgatory*, and need not doubt but they ſhould come to Heaven at laſt? And, Would not they be accounted great *Fools*, that would not live as they pleaſed in this World, as long as they could *buy* themſelves out of the pains of another? And by this means your *Church* hath not only *eaten*, but *grown fat, by the Sins of the People*; it being truly obſerved by *Spalatenſis*, *That the Doctrine of Purgatory hath been that which hath moſt inriched the Church of* Rome; which he gives as the reaſon of the moſt zealous contending for that Doctrine among thoſe of your Party, who find ſo much advantage by it. And we might eaſily believe there was ſomething extraordinary in it, when you tell us; *It is therefore firmly to be believed by all Catholicks, that there is a Purgatory; yea, we are as much bound to believe it, as we are bound to believe (for Inſtance) the Trinity or Incarnation itſelf: becauſe, ſince it is defined by the Church, we cannot lawfully, or without ſin and peril of damnation deny or queſtion this Doctrine.* We had need then look to ourſelves, who look on this Doctrine as a meer figment, that hath no foundation at all either in *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, or *Tradition* of the *Primitive Church*; but much more had you need to look to yourſelves, who dare with ſo much confidence obtrude ſo deſtructive a Doctrine to a *Chriſtian Life*, without any evidence of the truth of it, to be believed as much *as the Trinity or Incarnation it ſelf*; which expreſſions take them in the mildeſt ſenſe you can give them, carry a moſt inſufferable boldneſs with them. But theſe are not all the bold words which you utter on this Subject; for you ſay elſe where, *That* Bellarmin *doth not more boldly, than truly affirm, yea evidently prove, that all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, did conſtantly teach Purgatory from the very Apoſtles times, and conſequently that it muſt be held for an Apoſtolical Tradition, or nothing can be.* So then, if confidence would carry it, we muſt not only tremble at the fears of *Purgatory*; but we muſt firmly believe it as *an Article of Faith*, and as a moſt undoubted *Apoſtolical Tradition*.

De Repub. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 8. ſect. 73.

P. 371.

P. 350.

But before we can digeſt theſe things, we muſt ſee a little more ground for them, than as yet we do; and therefore you muſt be content to hear our reaſons, Why we neither look on it as a *matter* of *Faith* or *Apoſtolical Tradition*; in order to which nothing is more neceſſary, than to enquire what you mean by *Purgatory*. For as long as you can ſhelter yourſelves under general words, you think you are ſafe enough; but when we once bring you to a fuller explication of your meaning, *Purgatory* itſelf is not half ſo evident as thoſe *Impoſtures* are whereby you would maintain it. But for our clear underſtanding this Controverſie, we muſt find out what your *Doctrine* is concerning it; for, as confident as you are of it, there are not a few among you who are afraid to declare what you mean by it, leſt by that means the World ſhould ſee how far it is from having Foundation either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. We are therefore told by ſome who either are aſhamed of the Doctrine itſelf, or loth to betray their Cauſe (by declaring themſelves) that your *Church* requires no more than to believe that their is a *Purgatory*, for which they avouch the *Council* of *Trent*, which only defines *That the ſound Doctrine concerning Purgatory ſhould be taught*. This was indeed neceſſary to be ſaid by ſuch who do not at all believe the *Roman Doctrine* concerning it, whatever they pretend; but rather agree with the *Greek Church* about the Middle *ſtate* of *ſouls*.

But although the *Council* of *Trent* did not expresly define what they meant by *Purgatory*; yet the sense of the *Council* concerning it, is easie to be gathered from the comparing of places together in it. For the *Council* of *Trent* in the last *Session* when it passed the Decree of *Purgatory* referrs us to two things, by which we may fully understand the meaning of it; For in the Preface to the Decree, it saith, *That the Catholick Church had, in this and former Oecumenical Councils, taught that there was a Purgatory*; by which we may understand, What this *Purgatory* is, which was now decreed, and you say, we are bound to believe it as an Article of Faith. Now in all the former Decrees and *Anathematisms* of the *Council*, there is no place which seems to concern the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, so much as the thirtieth *Anathema* of the sixth *Session* in these words, *Si quis ita reatum pœnæ æternæ deleri dixerit; ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo vel in futuro in Purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit; Anathema sit. If any one shall affirm that the guilt of eternal punishment is so forgiven, as that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be paid, either in this life, or hereafter in Purgatory; before there can be any entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven; let them be Anathema.* From whence it evidently follows, that the Doctrine of *Purgatory* as it is taught by the *Council* of *Trent* doth depend upon this Principle, *That there is a guilt of temporal punishment remaining after the sin is pardoned, which temporal punishment is to be satisfied for, either in this life, or in Purgatory.* So that all those who are in *Purgatory* are there on that account, that they might satisfie the Justice of *God* for the *temporal punishment* of sin. For the *guilt* of moral *sin* being remitted by the merits of *Christ*, the punishment is supposed still to remain, which being exchanged from *eternal* to *temporal* by the *keys* of the *Church*, this *punishment* remains to be satisfied for, in the pains of *Purgatory*. But this punishment being *temporal*, the *possibility* of a *release* from them is necessarily supposed before the day of Judgment; for the *Council* of *Trent* in the *Decree* of *Purgatory*, declares that the *Souls* there detained are relieved by the *prayers of the Faithful, and especially by the sacrifice of the Altar. Which* in the 22d Session, it saith, *is offer'd* pro defunctis in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis, *for the departed in Christ not yet fully purg'd.* So that the satisfaction of the *debt* of *temporal punishment which remains when the sin is pardoned, and the translation of Souls from thence to Heaven by the prayers of the living and the sacrifice of the Mass*, are the main Foundations of the Doctrine of your *Church* concerning *Purgatory*.

§. 3. And this will further appear by the state of the Controversie between the *Greek* and *Latin Church* upon this Subject. For the main thing which the *Greeks* objected against the *Latins*, was this temporary punishment for sin, in a future state: For they say, in their *Apology* delivered into the *Council* of *Basil*, *We own no Purgatory fire, nor any temporary punishment by fire which shall have an end; for we received no such thing by tradition, nor doth the Eastern Church confess it.* And afterwards; *We deny that any Souls pass through this life to eternal fire; for in saying so, we should weaken the consent of the whole Church: and it is to be fear'd, if we should assert such a temporary fire, that People would be apt to believe, that all the fire in the other life were only temporary; by which means they would fall into such neglect and careleſsness, that they would make the more fuel for eternal fire.* And therefore they conclude, *That they neither have nor shall assert any such Purgatory fire.* But you would seem to perswade us, *That the Contest between the Greeks and Latins was only, whether the fire of Purgatory were material or no*; For you say, *The Greeks in the Council of* Florence *never doubted in the least measure,*

Apolog. Græcorum de Igne Purgat p. 66. ed. Salmas.

P. 398.

nor

nor denyed Purgatory it self, but only question'd, Whether the fire were material or metaphorical. But if you speak of those *Greeks*, who held to what was generally received in the *Greek Church*; you are very much deceived therein, for the sense of the *Greek Church* was fully delivered by them in this *Apology*, pen'd, as is supposed, by *Marcus Ephesius* but the Year before at the *Council of Basil*; and herein they not only dispute against the *fire*, but against any such *state* of *purgation* after this life, by the undergoing any temporary punishment for sin. For thus that *Apology* ends; *For these causes, the Doctrine proposed of a Purgatory Fire is to be cast out of the Church, as that which tends to slacken the endeavours of the diligent, and which hinders them from doing their utmost to purge themselves in this Life, since another purgation is expected after it.* Is not this plain enough for their denial of any state of *purgation* after this Life, by which Men might satisfie for the temporary punishment of sin, and be translated out of the state to the *Kingdom of Heaven?* And thence, although in the *Bull* of *Union* published by *Eugenius* 4. at the concluding the *Florentine Council*, no more was concluded, *than that those penitents who departed this Life, before they had satisfied for their former Sins by worthy fruits of Penance, should have their Souls purged after death,* poenis purgatoriis, *with Purgatory Punishments*, yet *Marcus Eugenius* utterly refused to subscribe it thus; which certainly he would never have done if all the Controversie had been only, *Whether the fire were real or metaphorical.* And the whole *Greek Church* utterly refused those terms of union, and therefore *Alphonsus à Castro* recounts the denying *Purgatory* among the Errors of the *Greeks.* The *Greeks* indeed do not believe that any Souls enjoy the *beatificial Vision* before the day of Judgment, and on that account they allow of *Prayer for the dead*, not with any respect to a deliverance of Souls out of *Purgatory*, but to the participation of their Happiness at the *great Day.* But there is a great deal of difference between this Opinion, and that of your *Church*; for they believe all Souls of Believers to be in expectation of the *final Judgment*, but without any temporary punishment for sin, or any release from that punishment by the *Prayers of the living*, which your *Church* asserts; and is the proper *state* of the *Question* concerning *Purgatory.* Which is not, Whether there be any *middle state* wherein the Souls of the Faithful may continue in expectation of the *final consummation* of their Happiness at the *great day*; nor, Whether it be lawful in that sense for the *Church* on earth to *pray* for *departed Souls* in order to their final *justification* at the *day* of *Judgment*, or in St. *Paul*'s language, *That God would have mercy on them in that day*; but, Whether there be such a *state*, wherein the Souls of Men undergo a *temporary Punishment for Sin*, the guilt being pardoned, out of which they may be *released* by the Prayers of the *living*, and translated from *Purgatory* to the *Kingdom of Heaven*, before the *day* of *Resurrection.* This is the true state of the *Question* between us and the *Church* of *Rome*; and now we come to examine, Whether your Doctrine concerning *Purgatory* be either an *Article* of *Faith*, or *Apostolical Tradition*; which how confidently soever you may assert, we shall find your confidence built on very little Reason.

Διὰ τὰ εἰρημένα νῦν καὶ τὸ προσκείμενον δόγμα τοῦ καθαρτηρίου πυρὸς ἀποβλητέον ἀν εἴη τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὡς ῥᾳθυμίαν ἐμποιοῦν τοῖς σπουδαίοις, ἐπιτεῖνον αὐτοὺς μὴ πᾶσι τρόποις ἀγωνίζεσθαι καὶ τὸν παρόντα βίον ἑαυτοὺς ἐκκαθαίρειν, ὡς προσδοκωμένης ἑτέρας καθάρσεως. P. 93.

Alphons. à Castro. l. 12. tit. purgat.

Which we may the easier believe, since there are so many among your selves, who do not think themselves obliged to own this Doctrine of your *Church* concerning *Purgatory.* Nay, we have not only the confession of several of your Party, that your Doctrine of *Purgatory* was not known in the *Primitive Church*, as *Alphonsus à Castro*, *Roffensis*, *Polydore*, *&c.* and of others, §. 4.

others, that it cannot be ſufficiently proved from *Scripture*, as *Petrus à Soto*, *Perionius*, *Bullenger*, whoſe Teſtimonies are produced by others; but there are ſome Perſons of note among you, who have expreſly denyed the Doctrine itſelf, and confuted the pretended reaſons which are given for it. *Petrus Picherellus*, ſaith, *There is no fuel to be found in Scripture, either to kindle or maintain the fire of Purgatory*; and which afterwards he largely diſproves in his excellent Diſcourſe *de Miſſa*. *Father Barns* acknowledges, *That the puniſhment of ſouls in Purgatory is a thing which lyes meerly in humane opinion, which cannot be firmly deduced from Scriptures, Fathers, or Councils. Yea*, (ſaith he, *with ſubmiſſion to better judgments*) *the oppoſite opinion ſeems more agreeable to them.* But later than theſe, you cannot but know, Who it is here at home, that hath not only pull'd down the ſuperſtructure, but raſed the very Foundations of your Doctrine of *Purgatory* in his diſcourſe *de medio Animarum ſtatu*: wherein he profeſſedly diſproves the Doctrine of your *Church* (though he is loth to own it to be ſo) in this particular, and ſhews at large, that it hath no foundation at all, either in *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, or *Reaſon*. But if your Doctrine of *Purgatory* be to be believed as an *Article of Faith*, and *Apoſtolical Tradition if any be*; How come theſe differences among your ſelves about it? How comes that Author not to be Anſwered, and his reaſons ſatisfied? But if you be not agreed among yourſelves, What this *Article* of *Faith* is, you are moſt unreaſonable Men, to tell us, We are as much bound to believe it as the *Trinity*, *or Incarnation*. We ask you, What it is we are bound to believe? You tell us, according to the ſenſe of your *Church*, *The Puniſhment of Souls in a future ſtate, out of which they may be delivered by the Prayers of the Faithful, and tranſlated into the Kingdom of Heaven*; Another he denyes all this, and ſaith, We are in effect only bound to believe, That faithful *Souls* do not enjoy their full Happineſs till the *Reſurrection*, and that there is no deliverance at all out of any ſtate in which Mens ſouls are after death, till the day of Judgement; and that the prayers of the *Church*, only reſpect that *Day*; but that the former Doctrine is ſo far from being an *Article* of *Faith*, that it is contrary to *Scripture*, *Antiquity* and *Reaſon*. If ſuch a ſtate of expectation wherein faithful Souls are at reſt (but according to different degrees of grace which they had at their departure hence, and look for at the *day* of *Reſurrection*, when they ſhall have a perfect conſummation of their bliſs) were all the *Purgatory* which your *Church* aſſerted, the breach might be far nearer cloſing as to this *Article*, than now it is. For although we find ſome particular Perſons ready to give a fair and tolerable ſenſe of your Doctrine herein; yet we cannot be ignorant, that the *General apprehenſion* and *ſenſe* of your *Church* is directly contrary; and thoſe Perſons who have diſcovered the *freedom* of their *judgments* as to this end and other particulars, know how much it concerns them to keep a due diſtance from *Rome*, if they would *preſerve* the *freedom* of their *Perſons*. But you are not one of thoſe that hath cauſe for any ſuch fears: for whatever *Bellarmin* ſaith, you are ready to ſwear to it, and accordingly ſet your ſelf to the defence of *Purgatory* upon his principles; which are far more ſuitable to the Doctrine of your *Church*, than to *Scripture* or *Antiquitty*.

Picherellus de Miſſâ c. 2. p. 150.

Punitio ergo in Purgatoria eſt res in opinione humanâ poſita: quæ nec ex Scripturis nec Patribus, nec Conciliis deduci poteſt firmiter: Immo, (ſalvo meliori judicio) oppoſita ſententia eis conformior videtur. Barns Catholico. Rom. Pacif. ſect. 9. I. D. ad fin. Paralip.

§. 5. But becauſe this Controverſie is not managed between his Lordſhip and you about the ſenſe of the *Scripture*, but the *Fathers* concerning it; I muſt therefore enquire, Whether your Doctrine of *Purgatory* were ever owned by the *Fathers* as an *Article* of *Faith* or *Apoſtolical Tradition*. And that I may the

the more fully clear it, before I come to examine your proofs for it, I ſhall lay down ſome general Conſiderations.

1. *Nothing out to be looked on as an Article of Faith among the Fathers, but what they declare, that they believe on the account of Divine Revelation.* As to all other things which they aſſert, we may look on them as *private opinions of particular Perſons*, but not as ſuch things which were received as *Articles of Faith*. For whatſoever is received as ſuch, it muſt be wholly on the account of *God's revealing* it, who only can oblige us to believe with that aſſent which is required to *Faith*. And if it be ſo as to all other things, much more certainly as to the *future ſtate* of *ſouls*, of which we can know nothing certainly without *Divine Revelation*. For ſince the *remiſſion* of *ſins*, and the *happineſs* of the *future Life*, depend upon the *goodneſs* and *mercy* of *God*, we can define nothing as to theſe things any further than *God* hath declared them. If *God* hath declared that *remiſſion* of *ſins* lyes in the taking away the *obligation* to *puniſhment*, it will be a contradiction to ſay, That he pardons thoſe whom he exacts the Puniſhment of ſin, from purely to ſatisfie his *juſtice*; if he hath declared, that the *ſouls* of the faithful are in joy and felicity as ſoon as they are delivered out of this ſinful World, it is impoſſible they ſhould undergo *unſufferable pains*, though not to *eternity*. I diſpute not now, Whether he hath ſo revealed theſe things, but that it is impoſſible for any thing to be looked on as an *Article* of *Faith*, but what hath clear *Divine Revelation* for it. And therefore, although many Teſtimonies of the *Fathers* might be produced one way or other, as to theſe things; when they ſpeak only their own fancies and imaginations, and not what *God* hath revealed, they cannot, all put together, make the opinion they aſſert to be an *Article* of *Faith*. Nothing is more apparent, than that the *itching curioſity* of humane nature to know more than *God* hath revealed, concerning the future ſtate of Souls, did betimes diſcover itſelf in the *Church*. But the ſtrange diverſity of theſe *Imaginations* were a ſufficient evidence, that they ſpeak not by any *certain Rule*, but according to their different *fancies*; and therefore that they did not deliver any Doctrine of *Faith*, but only their own private opinions. If you would therefore prove, that the *Fathers* did own *Purgatory* as an *Article* of *Faith*, you muſt not think it enough to prove; that one or two of the *Fathers* did ſpeak ſomething tending to it, but that all who had occaſion to mention it, did ſpeak of it as the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, and that which came from an immediate *Divine Revelation*.

2. *There is no Reaſon, That ſhould be looked on as an Article of Faith, which, they who ſeemed to aſſert it moſt, did build on ſuch places, which they acknowledged themſelves to be very obſcure.* For ſince they deduced it from *Scripture*, it is apparent that they did not believe it on the account of any *unwritten word*, or *Divine Revelation* conveyed meerly by *Tradition*; and ſince they confeſs the places to be very *difficult*, it is unreaſonable to judge, that they looked on that as a matter of *Faith*, which they ſuppoſed was contained in them. As for inſtance, St. *Auſtin* in ſeveral places aſſerts, that all things neceſſary to be believed are clearly revealed in *Scripture*, and withal he ſays, that the place 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. *is very difficult and obſcure*, and that it is one of thoſe places in St. *Paul*, which St. *Peter* ſaith are hard to be underſtood; and therefore it is not conceivable that St. *Auſtin* ſhould make any thing a *matter* of *Faith*, which he founds upon this place. And this is the great and almoſt only conſiderable place, which he or the reſt of the *Fathers* did inſiſt on, as to the nature of that *purgation* which was to be in a future ſtate.

Aug. de fide & oper. c. 15, 16.

3. *That*

3. *That cannot be looked on as an Article of Faith to such Persons, who express their own doubts concerning the truth of it.* For whatever is owned as an *Article* of *Faith* by any Person, is thereby acknowledged to be *firmly believed* by him. Now upon our enquiry into the *Fathers* we shall find, the first Person who seemed to assert that any faithful *Souls* passed through a *fire of purgation before the day of judgment*, was St. *Austin*: but he delivers his judgment with so much fear and hesitancy, that any one may easily see that he was far from making it an Article of Faith. We must consider then, that in St. *Augustin*'s time, there were many, who though they deny'd *Origen*'s Opinion as to the *Salvation* at last of all *Persons*; yet were very willing to believe it, as to all those who dyed in the *Communion* of the *Church*, that though they passed through the *flames* of *Hell* for their sins, yet at last they should be saved; and for this they mainly insisted on 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. where it is said, *That some should be saved, but as by fire. Such*, say they, *build upon the foundation gold, silver, precious stones, who to their Faith add good works: But they, hay, wood, and stubble, whose life is contrary to their Faith; and yet these latter, they asserted should come to Heaven at last, but they must undergo the torments of Hell first.* Against these St. *Austin* writes his book *de fide & operibus*, wherein he proves that such *as live in sin shall be finally excluded the Kingdom of Heaven*; and when he comes to the interpretation of that place, he gives this account of it, That those who do so love *Christ*, as rather to part with all things for him than to lose him, but yet have too great a love to the things of the world, shall suffer grief and loss on that account. *Sive ergo in hâc vita tantum homines ista patiuntur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quædam judicia subsequuntur; non abhorret, quantum arbitror, à ratione veritatis iste intellectus hujus sententiæ. Whether*, saith he, *Men suffer these things in this life, or such judgments follow after it; I suppose this Sense of S.* Paul's *meaning is not dissonant from truth.* So far was he from being certain of it, that he puts in, *quantum arbitror*, as far as I suppose; and yet he would not define, whether that loss which they were to suffer were only in *this life* or no. And, in his *Enchiridion* to *Laurentius*, where he disputes the very same matter, he saith, *Tale aliquid post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est; & utrum ita sit quæri potest, & aut inveniri aut latere, Nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatoriam, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari. It is not incredible that such a thing should be after this life, and it may be enquired after whether it be found to be so or no, that some Faithful Souls pass through a purging fire, and are saved sooner or later according to the degree of their affection to worldly things.* Will any Man in his wits think that St. *Austin* spake this of any *matter of Faith*, or that was generally received in the *Church* as an *Apostolical Tradition*? Did he ever speak so concerning the *Trinity* or the *Incarnation of Christ* which you parallel with *Purgatory*? What would Men have thought of him, if he had said of either of those Articles, *It is not incredible they may be true*, and *it may be inquired into whether they be or no*? Whatever then St. *Austin*'s private opinion was, we see he delivers it modestly and doubtfully, not obtruding it as an *Article* of *Faith*, or *Apostolical Tradition if any be.* And the very same he repeats in his Answer to the first *Question* of *Dulcitius*; so that this was all that ever he asserted as to this Controversie. What you offer to the contrary from other places of St. *Austin* shall be considered in its due place.

Aug. de fide & oper. c. 16.

Enchirid. c. 69.

4. *Where any of the Fathers build any Doctrine upon the sense of doubtful places of Scripture, we have no further Reason to believe that Doctrine, than we have*

have to believe that it is the meaning of thoſe places. So that in this caſe the enquiry is taken off from the *judgment* of the *Fathers*, and fixed upon the ſenſe of the *Scriptures* which they and we both rely upon. For ſince they pretend themſelves to no greater evidence of the *truth* of the *Doctrine* than ſuch places do afford; it is the greateſt reaſon that the Argument to perſwade us be not the Teſtimony of the *Father*, but the evidence of the place it ſelf. Unleſs it be evident ſome other way, that there was an univerſal *Tradition* in the *Church* from the *Apoſtles* time concerning it, and that the only deſign of the *Father* was, to apply ſome particular place to it. But then ſuch a *Tradition* muſt be cleared from ſomething elſe, beſides the ſenſe of ſome ambiguous places of *Scripture*, and that *Tradition* manifeſted to be *Univerſal* both as to time and place.

§. 6. Theſe things being premiſed, I now come particularly to examine the evidence you bring, *That all the Fathers both Greek and Latin did conſtantly teach Purgatory from the Apoſtles times, and conſequently that it muſt be held for an Apoſtolical Tradition or nothing can be.* And as you follow *Bellarmin* in your way of proving it, ſo muſt I follow you; and he divides his proofs you ſay into two ranks. Firſt, *Such who affirm prayer for the Dead.* 2. *Such who in the ſucceſſive Ages of the Church did expreſly affirm Purgatory.* Firſt, with thoſe *who affirm prayer for the Dead*; *Which* (you ſay) *doth neceſſarily inferr Purgatory, whatever the Biſhop vainly inſinuates to the contrary.* The *Queſtion* then between us is, Whether that *prayer* for the *Dead* which was uſed in the *ancient Church*, doth neceſſarily inferr; that *Purgatory* was then acknowledged? This you affirm; for, ſay you, *If there were no other place, or condition of being for departed Souls, but either Heaven or Hell, ſurely it were a vain thing to pray for the Dead; eſpecially to pray for the remiſſion of their Sins, or for their refreſhment, eaſe, reſt, relaxation of their pains, as Ancients moſt frequently do. From whence,* you add, *that Purgatory is ſo undeniably proved, that the Relator finding nothing himſelf ſufficient to Anſwer, was forced to put us off to the late Primate of* Armagh's *Anſwer to the Jeſuit's Challenge.* Which, you ſay, *You have peruſed, and find only there, that the Author proves that which none of you deny,* viz. *That the prayers and commemorations uſed for the Dead had reference to more Souls than thoſe in Purgatory. But,* you attempt to prove, *That the nature and kind of thoſe Prayers do imply that they were intended for other ends, than meerly that the Body might be glorified as well as the Soul, and to praiſe God for the final happy end of the deceaſed: Whereas that Anſwerer of the Jeſuit would,* you ſay, *by his allegations inſinuate to the Reader a conceit, that it was uſed only for thoſe two reaſons and no other; Which,* you ſay, *you muſt needs avouch to be moſt loudly untrue, and ſo manifeſtly contrary to the Doctrine and practice of the Fathers, as nothing can be more.* A high charge againſt two moſt *Reverend* and *learned Primates* together: againſt the one, *as not being able to Anſwer, and therefore turning it off to the other*; againſt the other, *for publiſhing moſt loud untruths, inſtead of giving a true account of the grounds of the Church's practice.* It ſeems, you thought it not honour enough to overcome one, unleſs you led the other in triumph alſo; but you do neither of them, but only in your own fancy and imagination. And never had you leſs cauſe to give out ſuch big words than here, unleſs it were to amuſe the Spectators, that they might not ſee how you fall before them. For it was not the leaſt diſtruſt of his ſufficiency to Anſwer, which made his Lordſhip to put it off to the *Primate* of *Armagh*, but becauſe he was prevented in it by him, *Who* (as he truly ſaith) *had very learnedly and at large ſet down other reaſons which the Ancients gave for Prayer for the dead without any intention to free them from Purgatory.* Which are not only

p. 306.

Answer to the Jesuits challenge, *p.* 195.

only different from, but inconsistent with, the belief of *Purgatory*; for the clearing of which, and vindicating my *Lord Primate* from your calumnies rather than Answers, it will be necessary to give a brief account of his Discourse on that Subject. He tells us therefore at first, That we are here prudently to distinguish the *Original Institution of the Church*, from the *private Opinions* of *particular Doctors*, which waded further herein than the general intendment of the *Church* did give them warrant. Now he evidently proves that the *Memorials*, *Oblations*, and *Prayers* made for the *Dead* at the beginning had reference to such as rested from their *labours*, and not unto any Souls which were thought to be tormented in that *Utopian Purgatory*, whereof there was no news stirring in those dayes. This he gathers first by the Practice of the ancient *Christians* laid down by the Author of the *Commentaries* on *Job*, who saith, The memorials of the *Saints* were observed as a memorial of rest to the Souls departed, and that they therein rejoyced for their *refreshing*. St. *Cyprian* saith, they offered Sacrifices for them, whom he acknowledgeth to have received of the Lord *Palms* and *Crowns*; and in the Author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, the Party deceased is described by him to have departed this life *repleniſhed with Divine joy, as now not fearing any change to worse, being come unto the end of all his labours, and publickly pronounced to be a happy Man, and admitted into the Society of the Saints*; and yet the *Bishop* prays, that *God would forgive him all his sins he had committed through humane infirmity, and bring him into the light and land of the living, into the bosoms of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob, *into the place from whence pain, and sorrow, and sighing flyeth.* And St. *Chrisostom* shews that the funeral Ordinances of the *Church* were appointed to admonish the living, that the Parties deceased were *in a state of joy and not of grief*; and therefore they sung at the *Burial*, *Return my Soul to thy rest, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee.* And this he proves likewise from the *Ancient Liturgies*, wherein prayers are made for all *Saints*, *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, *Apostles*, *Martyrs*, and others. And St. *Ambrose*, after he had said, *That* Valentinian *and* Gratian *were both blessed, and enjoyed the pleasures of everlasting life*; and yet subjoyns his *Orizons* for them. Thus he prays for *Theodosius*, *of whom he had said, That he enjoys everlasting light, and continual tranquility*: And so for his Brother *Satyrus*, when he had pronounced of him before, *That he had entered into the Kingdom of Heaven.* The same doth *Gregory Nazianzen* for his Brother *Cæsarius*. Now, Is it possible that you should think that Prayer for the *Dead*, as used in the Ancient *Church*, doth necessarily inferr *Purgatory*; when they who made these *Prayers*, did suppose the Persons they made them for, to be at *rest*, and in *joy*, and in the *Kingdom of Heaven*? And I hope that is a different state from that of *Purgatory*. Therefore you see, it is not barely proved, that some different accounts are given of *Prayer* for the *Dead*, but such as are exclusive of it, and those such as appear from the eldest times of the *Church*, when such Prayers were used. Now, having thus shewed, for whom these *Prayers* were made, he proceeds to shew, of what kinds they were, *whereof*, he saith, *some were Eucharistical* for the blessed estate of the party deceased; others *deprecatory*, and *petitory*, that *God* would forgive him *his sins*, keep him from *Hell*, and place him in the *Kingdom of Heaven*: which, though at first well meant, were turned to an ill use afterwards, when these *intercessions* began once to be applied not only to the good, but evil livers also, unto whom by the first Institution they were never intended. And he at large proves by very many examples, that the primary Intention of the *Church* in her supplications for the Dead, was,

P. 204.

P. 224.

That

That the whole Man (not the Soul ſeparated only) might receive *publick remiſſion* of *Sins*, and a Solemn acquittal in the Judgment of the great Day, and ſo obtain both a full eſcape from all the conſequences of Sin, and a perfect conſummation of Bliſs and Happineſs. And of this nature he ſhews afterwards were the Prayers of the *Church* uſed in *Epiphanius*'s time, which *Aerius* was condemned for rejecting of; and he plainly proves, that the *Church* of *Rome* comes neerer the Opinion of *Aerius*, than they would ſeem to do. For they agree with *Aerius*, in rejecting that kind of praying and offering for the Dead, which was uſed in the *Church* at that time; which was for ſuch as were believed to be in Bliſs. For, ſince the *Romaniſts* ſay, That without the ſuppoſition of *Purgatory*, Prayer for the Dead would be unprofitable, and at that time the Souls they prayed for, are ſuppoſed to be already in *bliſs*; therefore they do as much condemn thoſe Prayers for the *Dead*, which were then uſed, as *Aerius* did. And it is very ſtrange, if the releaſing of *Souls* out of *Purgatory*, had been any ground then of *praying for the Dead*, that *Epiphanius*, among all his far-fetcht Reaſons, ſhould never aſſign that, which you think to be the only proper ground of ſuch Prayers. Thus we ſee, what was the general Intention of the Church in thoſe Prayers which were made for the Dead, and how far this was from inferring *Purgatory*. P. 265.

§. 7. But beſides this, there were ſeveral *particular Opinions* among the Ancient *Fathers* touching the *place* and *condition* of *Souls ſeparated* from their *Bodies*: and according to the ſeveral Apprehenſions which they had thereof, they made different interpretations and applications of the *Uſe* of *praying* for the *Dead*; whoſe particular intentions and devotions in that kind, muſt of neceſſity therefore be diſtinguiſhed from the general intention of the whole *Church*. Thus there were two Opinions much in *vogue* among many of the *Fathers*, *viz. of Souls being kept in ſecret receptacles till the day of Reſurrection*, and the *purging of them in the Fire of conflagration at the day of Judgment*; of which Opinion were not only S. *Auguſtin*, but *Origen*, *Lactantius*, S. *Hilary*, S. *Ambroſe*, and others. Now according to theſe Opinions they interpreted the *Uſe* of *praying* for the *Dead*. And thence S. *Auguſtin* ſaith, *That the Oblations and Alms uſually offered in the Church for all the Dead that received Baptiſm, were Thankſgivings for ſuch as were very good, Propitiations for ſuch as were not very bad; but as for ſuch as were very evil, although they were no helps of the Dead, yet were they ſome kind of conſolations of the Living*; but this was only a private expoſition of the *Church*'s meaning in her Prayers, becauſe it is not to be found in the writings of the former *Fathers*; and, becauſe it ſuiteth not well with the general practice of the *Church*, which it intendeth to interpret. For it is ſomewhat too harſh an interpretation, to imagine that one and the ſame act of praying, ſhould be a petition for ſome, and for others only a Thankſgiving. Some other private Opinions there were beſides theſe, as that of *Theophylact*, That *God did not always caſt grievous ſinners into Hell, but that the Prayers of the Church might keep them from being caſt into Hell*; another, *That an augmentation of Glory might be procured for the Saints*, and either a total deliverance, or a diminution of torment at leaſt, obtained for the wicked; to which S. *Chryſoſtom* and others incline. Beſides, there were different Opinions concerning the benefit which the Dead received, by the Prayers of the Living. For the Author of the Queſtions and Anſwers in *Juſtin Martyrs works*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Theodoret*, *Diodorus*, *Tarſenſis*, and S. *Hierom*, all conclude that there is no releaſe to be expected for the Sins of thoſe who were dead. But others ſuppoſed, the *Dead* might receive profit by the *Prayers* P. 229. P. 207. P. 241. P. 243. P. 230.

of the *Living*, either for *remiſſion* of their *Sins*, or the *ceaſing* of their *Puniſhment*; but they were not agreed as to the nature of the *Sins*, which might be pardoned, or the manner of the benefit which they received, whether their puniſhment were only leſſened, or at laſt exſtinguiſhed. And *Stephanus Gobarus* in *Photius*, tells us, That though ſome held theſe things, yet the true Sentence of the *Church* was, *That none at all was freed from Puniſhment*. But that ſtill this was a Queſtion in the *Church*, Whether the Dead received profit by the Prayers of the Living, that *learned Author* more at large proves, but my deſign is only to give a very brief extract of his Diſcourſe, that you may from thence ſee, how far, by the *Intention* of the *Church* in *Praying for the Dead*, you are from gathering the neceſſary belief of *Purgatory*.

§. 8. And by this a full Anſwer is given to what you object *concerning the Practice of the Fathers, to pray for the Soul, and not the Body; and that when*
P. 361. *we pray for them, they receive Eaſe, Comfort, and Refreſhment by our Prayers, and that they obtain Pardon, and Mercy, and Deliverance from pain for them, and that by the help of our Prayers they are brought to Eternal Reſt and Happineſs.* But all this falls ſhort of your purpoſe, unleſs you can prove that any of them either believed or prayed that any ſuch *Eaſe* and *Refreſhment* were obtained by the *Prayers* of the *Living* before the *day* of *Reſurrection*. That they prayed, *That God would have mercy upon them in that day*, we deny not, which implies *Eaſe, Comfort, Refreſhment, Pardon, deliverance from Pain*, and *Eternal Happineſs*; but then all this refers not to any *Purgatory-pains*, which they had undergone before, but thoſe *eternal pains* which their Sins deſerved, if *God* ſhould deal in juſtice with them. We grant then, that Supplications and Interceſſions were uſed in the *Church* for the *Dead*, but we ſay, They did reſpect by the intention of the *Church* the *day* of *Judgment*, and *God's* final *juſtification* of them by his Sentence at that day. For the Scriptures (as my *Lord Primate* truly ſaith) every where do point out
Anſw. p. 217 that *great day* to us, as the *day* wherein *mercy and forgiveneſs, reſt and refreſhing, joy and gladneſs, Redemption and Salvation, Rewards and Crowns*, ſhall be beſtowed upon all *God's Children*, 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 1 Cor. 1. 8. Act. 3. 19. 2 Theſ. 1. 6, 7. Phil. 2. 19. 1 Theſ. 2. 16. 1 Pet. 1. 5. 1 Cor. 5. 5. Epheſ. 4. 30. Luk. 21. 28. 2 Tim. 4. 8. Luk. 14. 14. From whence it is no improbable deduction, that even the *Souls* of good Men, do not enjoy their full and compleat felicity, till the great day: not that they either ſleep or undergo any *Purgatory-pains*; but that they are at reſt from their labours, and in a bleſſed condition, but ſtill waiting with a ſolicitous expectation for the Glorious Coming of *Chriſt*, that they may then receive the reward prepared for them before the beginning of the World. But, Whether thoſe Souls be in *Heaven* (as it notes a place, and not a ſtate) whether the *degrees* of their *Happineſs* be proportionable (till the *great day*) to the *degrees* of *grace*, which they had when they left the World, are Queſtions of more curioſity, than neceſſity to be reſolved. But, as long as the *Scripture* doth inſiſt ſo much on the proceedings of the great *day*, both as to rewards and puniſhments, we do not condemn the practice of the *Ancient Church* in thoſe prayers which did thus reſpect the day of *Reſurrection*. If any of the *Fathers* had any particular Opinions concerning the *ſtate* of the *Dead*, and of the benefit which came to them by the Prayers of the Living; we are no more concerned to defend them, than you are to defend thoſe whom you acknowledge to hold, that no Souls did enjoy the *beatifical viſion* before the day of Judgment, againſt whom *Bellarmin* and others diſpute at large. Since you therefore confeſs yourſelves, that ſome of the greateſt of the *Fathers* did for many Ages hold erroneous Opinions concerning the *ſtate* of the

the *Dead*, With what reaſon can you preſs us with the Teſtimonies of thoſe whom you refuſe yourſelves? And ſince they had ſo many different Opinions concerning the ſtate of *Souls*, it ſeems ſtrange that none of them (at leaſt till St. *Auguſtin*'s time) ſhould hit upon ſuch a ſtate of *Purgation*, whereby they might be freed from pains before the day of Judgment. And yet we find not one of them, which did ſo much as dream of that *Purgatory* which you call *the upper Region of Hell*; or of any puniſhment, which they who dyed in favour with God, ſhould undergo between Death and Judgment, out of which they might be delivered by the Prayers of the Living. Many of them indeed ſuppoſed that *Souls* were kept in *ſecret receptacles*; but they were far from aſſerting that they underwent at all any pains equal to the *damned*, much leſs that any Souls were tranſlated thence to Glory upon the *interceſſions* made for them; others ſuppoſed that the *Souls* of all good Men were at laſt to paſs thorow the *Fire* of *conflagration* at the *day* of *Judgment*; others, that the Souls of wicked Men might either eſcape, or have their torments mitigated; but all this while your *Purgatory* was unthought of, and was not conceived till afterwards, through the *ignorance* and *Superſtition* of ſome, countenanced by pretended *apparitions* and *viſions* of Souls departed, till at laſt it grew to be one of the favourite Opinions of the *Roman Church*. From whence it may eaſily appear, how very much you were deceived, when you would inferr, becauſe *Prayer* for the *Dead*, as it is now uſed in the *Roman Church*, doth neceſſarily ſuppoſe *Purgatory*; therefore it muſt do ſo in the *Ancient Church*: for, altho' we ſhould grant the ſame *Prayers* to be ſtill uſed, yet ſince they are uſed for a quite different intent, that may be ſuppos'd by you, which was not at all ſuppos'd by them, nor could be infer'd from what they did. And yet it is plain, that in ſome caſes, you have changed the *Prayers* for the *Saints*, into *Prayers* to them: For, whereas in the old *Gregorian Sacramentary*, it was, *Grant unto us, O Lord, that this oblation may profit the Soul of thy Servant* Leo; in the latter Books it is turned into this, *Grant unto us, O Lord, that by the interceſſion of thy Servant* Leo, *this oblation may profit us*. From whence you may ſee, that your Prayers are changed from what they were: For the *Ancient Church* prayed univerſally for all *Saints and Martyrs*; but you think it a diſparagement to them to *pray* for them and therefore from your kind of Prayers for the Dead, we may well ſay, that *Purgatory* is ſuppoſed; but we cannot poſſibly inferr it from thoſe *Prayers* which were made for ſuch, who, if any, were ſuppoſed in a ſtate of Bliſs and Happineſs.

Anſwer to the Jeſuit, p. 210.

§. 9. And that the intention of your *Church* is quite different from the *Ancient*, we now come more fully to make manifeſt; becauſe none of them did believe that Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which you aſſert. But herein we muſt follow your footſteps, and conſider the many Authorities which you produce out of *Bellarmin*, and undertake to vindicate in behalf of *Purgatory*; to which I give this general Anſwer, That ſome Authors are counterfeit, and the places ſuppoſitions; of thoſe that are *true*, ſome ſpeak only of *Commemoration* of the *Dead*, and *Oblations* made for them; others reſpect the day of *Reſurrection*, and the *Fire* of *Conflagration*, others the *Purging* of the *wicked*, others only of a *purgation* in this life; but none of them all ſpeak of any *Purgatory-pains* of thoſe who dye in favour with *God*, which they undergo as the *temporal puniſhment of ſin, from whence they may be delivered by the Prayers of the Living*; which is the only thing you ſhould prove from them. And this I come to make appear by the examination of the particulars, as they occur in order.

The

The first you begin with, is, *Dionysius Areopagita*; and, *Is not he*, say you, *an Author of the first three hundred years*? As though this had never been questioned by any? If you had asked, Whether he had been an Ancient and Learned Author, living sometime within the first four hundred years; you should not have met with any opposition from me. But if you would needs have him to be the true *Dionysius*, you must prove it better than by meer referring us to what *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, and *Del-Rio* have said upon that Subject; and you were very strangly deceived when you say, *That only* Erasmus, *and* Valla, *and some few others, did doubt of it; but at present you suppose few Learned Men doubt of the matter.* For, even *Bellarmin* himself doubts of it; and, What think you of *Hibertus*, *Sirmondus*, *Launæus*, *Petavius*? Are not all these with you learned Men, who have all declared their doubts of it? and so will any one else do, that impartially examines the Arguments brought on both sides. But we have no reason to insist longer upon this, since you say, *It is sufficient, that he is acknowledged for a Writer of great Antiquity*; Well, But what is it then this Author saith? only that *Prayers were made for the deceased party, that God would forgive his Sins, and place him in the Light and Countrey of the Living*: But, say you, *both the Archbishop and Primate would have thought that Man a Papist, who would have made the like prayer for his deceased Friend in their hearing.* And very good reason they might have to think so, when they know beforehand that your intention of praying for the *Dead*, is, to deliver their Souls from the pains of Purgatory; but, if they had heard one use such a Prayer in the *Ancient Church*, they could not have imagined, it was for any such intention, since the same Person in *Dionysius* is said to be *replenished with Divine Joy, and not fearing any change to the worse, but knowing well that the good things possessed, shall be firmly and everlastingly enjoyed*; as he speaks at his entrance upon that Discourse: And, *if this be in effect to teach Purgatory*, as you would have it, you must set your *Purgatory* a great deal higher than you do; for, you say, It is but an *upper Region of Hell*, a little after, when *Dionysius* speaks of those who were in a Region of rest and Happiness.

P. 361.

De confirm. l. 2. c. 7.

Dionys. Areop. de Eccles. Hier. cap. 7.

Your second Author is *Tertullian*; and three Citations you produce out of him. In the first, he only mentions the *Oblations for the Dead*, which we have confessed to be used already, but without any respect to *Purgatory*. In the second, a mention is made of begging of God *refrigerium, refreshment for the Soul of one departed*: this were something to the purpose, if you had first proved, that *Tertullian* did suppose that Soul to be then in the pains of *Purgatory*; for then it were but reason to think this *refrigerium* did relate to the easing of them. But he elsewhere tells us, what he means by this *refrigerium*, *Sinus Abrahæ interim refrigerium præbiturus est animabus justorum*, by which he understands not any *deliverance* from *pains*, but contentment in expectation of the future *Resurrection*. It was the ardency of the desire after that which made them pray for this *refrigerium*, not out of any *punishment* they were supposed to be under for Sin, but their earnest expectation of future glory. And, since they supposed different degrees of *refreshment* which the Souls had in the *bosom* of *Abraham*, this prayer only notes the desire of the continuance and increase of it, and not being under present pains for the want of it.

De Coron. Mili. c. 3.

De Monog. c. 10.

C. Marc. l. 4. c. 34.

In the last place of *Tertullian*, you would fain have the *Carcer infernus* to be *Purgatory*, but he means no more by it than *Hades*, or the common receptacle of *Souls* till the *day* of *Resurrection*, which *Irenæus* calls *locum invisibilem*, which renders ἀιδης exactly, in which he makes Souls to stay till the

De animâ c. 34.

Iren. l. 5. cap. 25.

day

day of *Resurrection*; and *Tertullian* explains himself afterwards, when he sayes, *Constituimus omnem animam apud Inferos sequestrari in diem Domini*; and therefore *Bellarmin* confesses *Tertullian* to be one of those, that held that no *Souls* did enjoy the *beatifical vision*, till the *day* of *Resurrection*; at which time he supposed the order of rising, to be according to the degrees of holiness; and therefore he makes the punishment of Souls not to be any *Purgatory pains*, but the *mora resurrectionis*, that they should be longer before they rise from the dead, *viz.* towards the latter end of the thousand years; for so he makes the *Resurrection* to continue the thousand *years* of *Christ's Reign* upon earth; and, as the highest rank of *Christians* should rise in the beginning of it, so others in their order according to their *degrees*, and the most slothful and negligent to be punished *mora resurrectionis*, by their Resurrection being deferred to the conclusion of it. By which we may fully understand *Tertullian*'s meaning, *Judex in carcerem te mandet infernum, unde non dimittaris, nisi modico quoque delicto morâ resurrectionis expenso*; by which *lower Prison* he intends neither *Hell* nor *Purgatory*, but the common *receptacle* of Souls, wherein they were held till they should rise sooner or later according to the measure of their graces and sins. *De An. cap. 55.*

§. 10. The next place to be examined, is the noted one of St. *Cyprian*, to *Antonianus*: where he gives an account of the difference between the lapsed Persons who become penitents, and the Martyrs. *Aliud est adveniam stare, aliud ad gloriam pervenire*; *aliud missum in carcerem non exire inde, donec solvat novissimam quadrentem*; *aliud statim fidei & virtutis mercedem accipere*; *aliud pro peccatis longo dolorere emendari, & purgari diu igne, aliud peccata omnia passione purgâsse. It is one thing to stay in hope and expectation of pardon, another thing to come presently to glory*; *'tis one thing to be cast into prison, and not to come out thence, till you have paid the last farthing*; *another to receive presently the reward of our Faith: 'tis one thing to be amended for sins by long grief, and to be purged with fire a great while*; *another to have purged away all his sins by suffering Martyrdom*, *Did not S.* Cyprian, say you, *think of Purgatory, when he taught this?* No, that did he not, if we believe your own Writers. For *Rigaltius* tells us, that S. *Cyprian* here speaks of the severities of *Penance*, which the lapsed Persons underwent in order to *pardon*; and compares them with the present *felicity* which *Martyrs* were possessed of. And this was that purging *fire* in order to their amendment, which he insists on, to shew what great disparity there was betweeen the state of these *Penitents*, and the *Martyrs*; thereby to shew, that though Penitents were admitted by the *Church*, yet it was with so much severity, that might give little encouragement for Men to fall in hopes of admission. For that was the main thing which S. *Cyprian* there discourses of. And thus likewise *Albaspinæus* understands it, of such who suffered penance all their Life-time, and were absolved only at the point of Death; these were they who were *held in prison till they paid the utmost farthing*. Neither may it seem strange that this should be called a *purging fire*; since S. *Hierom* describing, the penance of *Fabiola*, saith, *Sedit super carbones ignis*, *She sate upon coals of fire*; and *Pope Siricius* in his Epistle to *Himmerius* extant in the *Councils*, calls, *perpetual penance*, *purificatorium pœnitudinis ignem*, the purging fire of penance. And this seems a great deal more probable to be S. *Cyprian*'s meaning, because he speaks most clearly of any of the *Fathers* of the immediate Happiness of all *God's Children* after death, in his excellent Book of *mortality*; wherein he comforts the *Christians* of *Carthage* against the fears of death, by Reason of the raging plague,

Rigalt. observ. ad Cypr. 68.

Albaspin. observ. l. 2. c. 12

Hierom. ep. Fab. ad Ocean.

plague, which was then among them. *It is for him*, ſaith he, *to fear death, that would not go to Chriſt*; *it is for him not to be willing to go to Chriſt, that doth not believe he ſhall begin to reign with him*; with much more to the ſame purpoſe throughout that Book, which, I pray read, and then tell me, Whether St. *Cyprian* did think of *Purgatory* or no.

§. 11. I wonder with what face you produce *Origen*'s Teſtimony in behalf of your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, ſince *Bellarmin* confeſſes that he held all *puniſhment* to be only *Purgatory*; and that this Opinion of his was condemned in the fifth *Oecumenical Council*. *But*, you ſay, *in the place produced by you, he ſaith no ſuch thing, but that Men are purged according to the mixture of Lead and Gold in them, but that thoſe who have all Lead, ſhall ſink down to the* p. 363. *bottomleſs pit for ever. Than which* (you ſay) *nothing can be ſpoken more clearly for Purgatory.* To which a ſhort Anſwer ſhall ſerve by this *Dilemma*; either you have faithfully repreſented this place of *Origen*, or not: If you have, it is plain that *Origen* hath been infinitely abuſed, or elſe apparently contradicts himſelf; for you make him here plainly to aſſert the *eternity* of *puniſhment*, which the *fifth General Council* according to you *infallibly* condemned him for denying; if you have unfaithfully repreſented him, then ſtill *Origen* cannot be underſtood of ſuch a *Purgatory* as you ſpeak of, but of ſuch a one which all muſt paſs thorow, good and bad; and their continuance in it, is according to the proportions of good or evil in them. And of ſuch a *Purgatory* as this, *Bellarmin* confeſſes that *Origen* ſpeaks: and which he places after the *Reſurrection*, and ſaith, That *even* Peter *and* Paul *muſt paſs thorow it*. And for ſuch *Purgatory* as this is, many places are produced out of *Origen*, by *Sixtus Senenſis*, and many others. But this is an univerſal *Purgatory* for *good* and *bad*, after the *Reſurrection*, and for the *Body* as well as the *Soul*; and judge you now, Whether this be the *Purgatory* you contend for or no. The follwing Teſtimonies of St. *Ambroſe*, *Hilary*, *Lactantius*, St. *Hierom*, *&c.* are taken off by *Bellarmine* himſelf; ſince, although in his firſt Book he produceth them for the *Roman Doctrine* of *Purgatory*, yet in the beginning of the Second he confeſſeth, that all theſe were for ſuch an *Univerſal Purgatory* at the day of Judgment, thorow which all muſt paſs, not the *Virgin Mary* her ſelf excepted. And St. *Hierom*, though he denies *Origen*'s *Hypotheſis* as to the *final Salvation* of all, yet ſeems by the places you cite out of him, very willing to admit of it, as to all ſuch who dye in the *Churches Communion*; againſt which Opinion St. *Auguſtin* at large diſputes, as I have ſhewed already. I acknowledge then that theſe Authors do ſpeak of a *purging fire*, but ſuch a one as yourſelves diſown and diſpute againſt, and *Bellarmine* could no other wayes bring any of them off, but by ſaying, That they ſpeak of the fire of the laſt Judgment; by which we ſee the apparent *Sophiſtry*, in bringing thoſe as plain places for your *Purgatory*, which you confeſs yourſelves, are underſtood of ſomething elſe. It being confeſſed that they ſpeak of *purging*, conſequent to the *Reſurrection*, which is quite another thing from what you plead for. And beſides, it is plain from St. *Hierom*'s words, that he ſpeaks of *wicked Men dying in the Communion of the Church, that they ſhall at laſt be ſaved*. And if you will needs have *arbitramur*, when it is oppoſed to *credimus*, to ſignifie a firm belief, (which is another proof of your skill in *Lexicons*) that which you can only inferr thence, is, that *S. Hierom* did, as firmly believe that *wicked Men* (if Chriſtians) ſhould at laſt be ſaved, as that *Devils*, and *Atheiſts*, and other wicked Men ſhould be finally damned. For theſe are his words; *Et ſicut Diaboli & omnium negatorum, atque impiorum qui dixerunt in corde ſuo,*

De Purgat. l. 2. c. 1.

Biblioth. l. 5. Annot. 170.

Sixtus Sen. Biblioth. l. 5. Annot. 171.

Comment. in Iſa. 66. ad fin.

suo, non est Deus, credimus æterna tormenta; sic peccatorum atq; impiorum, & tamen Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atq; purganda, moderatam arbitramur, & mixtam dementiæ sententiam Judicis. And the same he rather more fully asserts in the other place, *& Christianos, si in peccato præventi fuerint, salvandos esse post pœnas*; but you who are never backward in helping the *Fathers* to speak out, very commodiously render it, *Such as dye before full and perfect Penance for the sins, of which they had truly repented:* Which is far from *Purgatory* as from St. *Hierom's* meaning, for he doth not oppose *penitent Sinners* to *impenitent*, but opposes *wicked Men dying in the Church's Communion*, to the *Devil* and his *Angels*, and all other wicked Persons, *All which* (he saith) *shall perish eternally, but such as are Christians should be saved at last after undergoing punishment.* And it is to be observed, that at the end of the *Commentaries* on *Isaiah*, he immediately before speaks of that which is supposed to be the *Origenical Hypothesis*, viz. *That the Torments of the other Life shall after a long time be ended*; and when he hath produced the places of *Scripture* which the favourers of it did produce, he only passes this censure of it, *Quod nos Dei solius scientiæ debemus derelinquere*; *Which we ought to leave to the Knowledge of God alone*; and then concludes with that moderation of his sentence, That he did believe the *Eternity* of Torments of *Devils*, *Atheists*, &c. but of such who were *Christians he did suppose God would mingle Mercy with his Justice, and that after they had been sufficiently purged by Fire they might escape at last.* If he had intended only a mitigation of their *Torments* who were *Christians*, the opposition could not lye as it doth between the *Eternity* of some, and the *Clemency* of *God* in others, but the *Eternity* must have been confessed in both, and the opposition made only in the *weight* of the *Torments* of such who were not *Christians* above such as were. If St. *Hierom* doth (as *Bellarmine* contends) elsewhere contradict this, by so much the less is his Testimony of any validity in this Case, it being plain what his meaning is here; but that seems the less probable, because he writ his *Books* against the *Pelagians* in which he asserts the same, not long before his death. This *Purging-fire* then, of St. *Hierom* makes little for your purpose, since it is only a more refined branch of *Origen's Hypothesis*, and is understood of a *fire* after the *Resurrection*, and that of Hell, and not of *Purgatory*, and wherein wicked Men shall be purged if they dyed in the *Church's Communion*, and not such who repented of their Sins in this life. But if St. *Hierom* himself do not speak to the purpose, you hope one under his name may do it (and we must needs say *Purgatory* hath been always beholding to *forgeries*) for you cite his *Commentaries on the Proverbs*, which are rejected as counterfeit by *Sixtus Senensis*, *Canus*, *Marianus Victorius*, and *Bellarmine* himself.

Con. Pelag. l. 1.

But from St. *Hierome* we proceed to St. *Basil*, *who*, you say, *teaches the same Doctrine with him*; if he doth, it is very little for your comfort. But so far was St. *Basil* from asserting your Doctrine, that although he speaks of a *purging-fire*, he speaks not at all concerning it in another *Life*, but only of that which purgeth out *Sins* in the *Souls* of Men in this life. For he calls the *Spirit of God* working upon Mens Souls, that πῦρ καθαρτικὸν, which *consumes Sin* within them; as may be seen by comparing his Commentaries on the sixth and the ninth of *Isaiah* together. And where he afterwards speaks not of an utter *rejection*, but an *expurgation* as by *Fire*; it is plain that he understands it of the *Fire* of *affliction* in this life, and not the *Fire* of *Purgatory* in another. But wherever you meet with *Fire* and *purging*, you think it impossible to be understood of any thing but your *Purgatory*; it seems you are hugely pos-

§. 12. *P.* 365.

Comment. in Isa. 9.

ſeſſed with the fears of it, that you think you meet with it, wherever you go. But if you will needs have St. *Baſil* to ſpeak of a future ſtate, then your own *Sixtus Senenſis*, and *Eſtius* will tell you that he is to be underſtood of the *Fire* of *Conflagration* at the *Day* of *Judgement*; of which he ſpeaks in ſeveral other places. And ſo *Nicetas* underſtands the place of *Gregory Nazianzen* which you produce about *Baptiſm by Fire*, for ſaith he, *Per ignis baptiſmum, examen cenſuramque divini judicii intelligit*, and for that cites the place of the *Apoſtle*, *Every Man's work ſhall be tryed by Fire.* This he calls elſewhere *the laſt fire* by which our works ſhall be judged and purged. And of this *Lactantius* and *Hilary*, are to be underſtood: for *Hilary* expreſly ſaith, *That even the Virgin* Mary *ſhall paſs through it*, whom I hope you will not place in *Purgatory.* The Teſtimony of *Bœtius* ſhall then be taken, when you prove that he doth not ſpeak in the Perſon of a *Philoſopher*, but of a *Chriſtian*, delivering Matters of Faith with an *ut puto*; but if you had conſidered the deſign of his Book, for the ſake of *Philoſophy*, you might have ſpared his citation. And ſo you might for your own ſake that of *Theodoret*, which not only the *Greeks* in their *Apology* cry out on as counterfeit; both no ſuch place, as yet appears in any edition of *Theodoret.* And the ſame *Greeks* tell you, if you conſulted the honour of *Gregory Nyſſen* you would ſpare him too, becauſe he was a favourer of the *Origenical Hypotheſis* concerning the *reſtitution* of all things; and ſo many places are produced out of him wherein he makes the nature of all pains to be Purgatory, that the *Patriarch Germanus* (of whom *Photius* ſpeaks) had no other way to vindicate him, but by ſaying that the *Origeniſts* had foiſted many places into his works. If you would therefore ſay, *That it is a groundleſs calumny, to ſay that any of the Fathers did corrupt the Chriſtian Doctrine by the opinions of* Plato; you muſt either deny that *Origen* and his followers ever aſſerted any Doctrine contrary to *Chriſtianity*, and therein contradict the fifth *Oecumenical Council*; or that any of the *Fathers* had any touch of *Origen*'s opinion: both which I ſuppoſe are tasks you will be unwilling to undertake. But whether their opinions are true or falſe (which we are not now enquiring after) to be ſure they are far enough from your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which ſuppoſeth the Sin pardoned in this life, and yet the *Puniſhment* undergone for it in another: which Doctrine if it were granted at all reaſonable, it would be much more, aſſerting it to be after the *Reſurrection*, when the Body might endure Pains as well as the Soul, than ſo abſurdly as you make the *Soul* only to ſuffer, and that too in a way the moſt unlike of all other, *viz.* by a *material fire.*

Sixtus Sen. l. 5. Annot. 171. *Eſtius in 1 Cor. 3.* *Nazian. orat. 39.* *orat. 26.* *In Pſal. 118.* *P. 367.* *Biblioth. God. 233.*

§. 13. *P. 368.* But it is time we come to the ſuccour of St. *Auſtin*, who it ſeems hath his ſhare of *Purgatory* in this life; for, you ſay, *He hath the ill hap to be uſed the worſt of all other.* Becauſe his Lordſhip repreſents him as *dubious and uncertain* (as no doubt he was) in this point: which argues indeed that he was a *Novice* in your *Roman Faith*, but thereby the more a *Father* of the *Church.* But you are the Man, that, let St. *Auguſtin* ſay what he will himſelf, will prove to his face, that he could not poſſibly be thought to deny or doubt of *Purgatory.* And it is a Combat worth ſeeing, to ſee you diſpute againſt St. *Auguſtin*; but you do it ſo pitifully, that St. *Auſtin* remains as uncertain as ever he was. The only place which ſeems to the purpoſe, *Conſtat animas purgari poſt hanc vitam, &c.* is ſo notorious a counterfeit, that not only *Vives* confeſſes no ſuch words appeared in the Ancient Copies; but they are wholly left out, not only in the *Baſil Edition*, 1556. but in that of *Lyons* 1560. and in the latter *Lovain* and *Paris* Editions, The other places, you confeſs yourſelf, relate to the benefit which the

the Dead receive by the Prayers of the Living, of which a large Account hath been already given without any ſuppoſition of *Purgatory*. Whether St. *Auſtin*'s doubts did refer only to the Circumſtances of *Purgatory*, and not to the thing itſelf, I leave it to the Conſideration of any reaſonable Man, who will read the places already cited, wherein thoſe Doubts are expreſſed. By which one may ſee at what rate you uſe your Expreſſions, when you can have the face to ſay, *That S.* Auſtin *no leſs conſtantly teaches the Doctrine of Purgatory, than he doth the Doctrine of Heaven and Hell.* Which after the language of the *Sorborn*-Cenſures, is a *falſe*, *raſh*, and *ſcandalous aſſertion*, and as ungrounded as *Purgatory* itſelf. The remaining Teſtimonies of St. *Cyril* and St. *Chryſoſtom*, only ſpeak of *Prayer* for the *Dead*, and the Benefit of that, and ſo offers nothing new to our Conſideration. But at laſt we are come to a Man who did in good earneſt believe *Purgatory*, and was the firſt of any Name in the *Church* who did ſo, and that is *Gregory* I. But whoſoever reads in his *Dialogues* the excellent Arguments he builds it on, and confirms it with, will find as much Reaſon to pity his *Superſtition* and *credulity*, as to condemn his *Doctrine*. And *after this time*, his Lordſhip ſaith truly, *Purgatory was found to warm a buſineſs to be ſuffer'd to cool again; and in the after-Ages more were frighted, then led by proof into the belief of it.* And although amidſt the variety of Judgments among the Fathers concerning the ſtate of the Dead, not one of them affirmed your Doctrine of *Purgatory*, before *Gregory* I; yet by all means you will needs have it to have been ſtill owned as an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and an *Article of Faith*. But I commend you, that knowing the weakneſs of the Arguments brought from the *Fathers* and *Scripture*, you at laſt take *Sanctuary* in the *Church's definition*; on the Account of which you ſay, *We are as much bound to believe it as any other Article of Faith, yea, as the Trinity or Incarnation itſelf.* But this holds for none, but only thoſe who ſo little underſtand the grounds of their *Religion* as to belive it on the account of your *Church's Infallibility*; which is ſo far from being any ground of *Faith*, that if we had nothing more certain than that, to eſtabliſh our *Faith* upon, you would be ſo far from making Men believe *Purgatory* on that account, that you would ſooner make them Queſtion, whether there were either *Heaven* or *Hell*. But though your *Church* be ſo far from *Infallibility* that we have found her guilty of many Errors, yet the *Word of God abideth for ever*, which alone is the ſure Foundation for our *Faith* to reſt upon. And ſo I conclude with your own *Prayer: I beſeech God to give all Men light to ſee this Truth, and Grace to aſſent unto it; to the end, that by living in the Militant Church in the Unity of Faith, we may come at laſt to meet in Glory in the Triumphant Church of Heaven, which we may hope for by the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, To whom with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, be all honour and glory world without end.*

P. 372.

A REPLY *to Mr.* J. Serjeant's *Third* Appendix, *Containing ſome* Animadverſions *on the Book Intituled*, A Rational Account of the Ground of the Proteſtant Religion.

To his honoured Friend Dr. *Tillotſon.*

SIR,

§. 1. AS ſoon as I underſtood your Intentions to anſwer Mr. *Serjeant*, I could not but rejoyce on his behalf, as well as on the Truth's and your own. For I have that real kindneſs for him, that I heartily wiſh him that Reaſon and Science he pretends to; which I could not but deſpair of his attaining, unleſs he were undeceived in that monſtrous opinion he hath of himſelf and his undertakings. And I knew no Perſon more fit than you, to let him underſtand the truth and himſelf together. In which, your Performances have been ſo clear and ſatisfactory, that I hope Mr. *Serjeant*, inſtead of another Letter of directions to his Anſwerer, will write you one of thanks, for the reaſon and kindneſs you have ſhewed him throughout your Book. Unleſs it fares with you, as it hath done with ſome other *Adverſaries* of theirs, that their civility hath been interpreted as an Argument of their uncertainty, and their own confidence cry'd up for a demonſtration. In which ſenſe only I ſhall grant our *Proteſtant* Writers to build on uncertainties, and Mr. *White* and Mr. *Serjeant* to be the great *Demonſtrators* of this Age. If their own reaſon had been as *ſevere* as the *cenſures* at *Rome* againſt them, they had ſaved us the labour of any anſwer, and would have found out their own *ſophiſtry* without a confutation. But the leaſt thing we can imagine by their exceſſive confidence, is, that they are deceived themſelves; and therefore it is a part of charity to them, as well as juſtice to the Truth, to let the World ſee, that big words are quite another thing from Science, and a ſtrong preſumption from a regular demonſtration. As to which, no more need to have been ſaid, than what you have already done, if Mr. *Serjeant* had not thought it an acceſſion to the glory of his atchievements, to lead two Pages of my Book in triumph after him. I confeſs, I was ſomewhat ſurprized to ſee a Perſon who would be noted for his valour in aſſaulting *Proteſtant* Writers, ſteal ſo behind the main bulk and deſign of my Book; and when he had gotten two ſingle Pages by themſelves, fall upon them with as much pomp and oſtentation, as if he had attack'd the whole. And this muſt be noiſed abroad as an *Anſwer* to me, by the ſame figure that his Arguments are called demonſtrations, which is by an *hyperbole* unfit for any, but ſuch *who never flag below the ſphear of Science* in their own Judgments, though they ſeem not to come near it in others. Yet ſince Mr. *Serjeant* is not only pleaſed to concern himſelf ſo far as to Anſwer that part of my Book relating to Oral Tradition; but in moſt expreſs terms to challenge

challenge me to reply to him, he may, now ſee (as ſoon as I could get any Liberty from greater Imployments) how ready I am to give him all reaſonable Satisfaction. And in the firſt place, I return him thanks for the weapon he hath made choice of, *viz.* that of *Reaſon*; there being no other I deſire to make uſe of, in managing this debate between us: And I hope he will find as much civility towards him throughout this diſcourſe as he expreſſes towards me in the entrance to his; if that may be accounted any real civility, which is intended merely out of deſign, with the greater advantage to diſparage the cauſe I have undertaken, and yet ſee no reaſon to repent of. *If in his curſory view of two Chapters of my Book he had* (as he ſaith) *quite loſt me*, he had no Cauſe to be troubled for it, if he had found far more excellent Perſons, *ſuch as* Dr. *Hammond*, *and the Diſſuader*, *and* Dr. *Pierce*, *inſtead of me*. But to be ſure, he intends not this in honour to any of us, but by a way of a common reproach to us all, as though *we did not talk out of nature or things*, *but words and imagination*. I could heartily have wiſhed, Mr. *S.* would have *cropt ſo much of the victory due to another's Learning and Induſtry*, as to have ſhewed me one propoſition in thoſe Diſcourſes, *which a rational underſtanding*, *that would be true to itſelf*, *could not ſettle or rely on*. But if ſuch inſinuations as theſe muſt paſs for anſwers, I muſt needs ſay, I judge Mr. *S.* equally happy in confuting our grounds, and in demonſtrating his own; in both which, his greateſt ſtrength lies in the *ſelf-evidence* of his bare affirmations. But it ſeems he is willing to reſign the glory of this *Victory* to the *judicious Author* of *Labyrinthus Cantuarienſis*, or to ſome others for him; and when they have once obtained it, ſhall not envy them the honour of it. And I ſuppoſe thoſe Perſons, whoever they are, may be able by this time, to tell Mr. *S.* it is an eaſier matter to talk of *Victories* than to get them. But if they do no more in the whole, than Mr. *S.* hath done for his ſhare, they will triumph no-where, but where they conquer, *viz.* in their own fancies and imaginations. Therefore leaving them to their ſilent conqueſts, and as yet, unheard-of Victories, we come to Mr. *S.* who ſo liberally proclaims his own in the point of oral tradition. *Which* (in a phraſe ſcarce heard of in our Language before) *is the Poſt*, he tells us, *he hath taken upon him to explicate farther and defend*. What the *explicating a Poſt* means, I as little underſtand, as I do the force of his demonſtrations; but this, and many other ſuch uncouth forms of ſpeech, up and down in his Book (which make his ſtyle ſo ſmooth and eaſie,) are I ſuppoſe intended for embelliſhments of our Tongue, and as helps to *ſure-ſpeaking*, as his whole Book is deſigned for *ſure-footing*. P. 202

But leting him enjoy the pleaſure and felicity of his own expreſſions, I come to conſider the matter in debate between us. And his firſt controverſie with me, is, *for oppoſing the Infallibility of Oral Tradition*, *to Doctrinal Infallibility in Pope and Councils*. A Controverſie fitter to be debated among themſelves, than between him and me: For is any thing more notorious, than that *Infallibility* is by the far greateſt part of *Romaniſts* attributed to the preſent *Church*, in teaching and delivering matters of Faith, not by virtue of any Oral Tradition, but the immediate aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and that this is made by them the only ground of Divine Faith; For which Mr. *S.* may if he pleaſe, conſult his *judicious Author* of *Labyrinthus Cantuarienſis*, or any other of their preſent Writers, except Mr. *White* and *himſelf*. He need not therefore have been to ſeek for the meaning of this doctrinal Infallibility, as oppoſed to Traditionary, if he had not either been ignorant of the opinion of their own Writers, or notoriouſly §. 2. P. 203.

notoriouſly diſſembled it. For this Infallibility is not attributed to the Rulers of the Church, meerly as *Doctors* or *Scholars*, but as the repreſentative *Church*, whoſe Office it is, to deliver all Matters of Faith by way of an infallible Teſtimony to every Age, and thereby to afford a ſufficient foundation for Divine Faith. But Mr. *S.* atributes no ſuch Infallibility to the repreſentative Church, as teaching the reſt, but derives their Infallibility from ſuch grounds as are common to all parts of the eſſential Church. Wherein he apparently oppoſes himſelf to the whole current of their own Authors, who reſolve all Faith into the immediate aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; without which, they aſſert, there could be no Infallibility at all in Tradition, or any thing elſe; and therefore theſe Opinions are as oppoſite to each other as may be. For ſuch an Infallibility is not attributed by them to the Teachers of the *Church*, merely *on ſome ſignal occaſions*, as Mr. *S.* ſeems to ſuppoſe, when they are to explain new Matters of Faith; but it is made by them to be as neceſſary as believing itſelf, becauſe thereby the only ſure foundation of Faith is laid; and therefore it is very evident, they make it proper to the Church in all Ages: Or elſe in ſome Age of the Church Men were deſtitute of ſufficient grounds of Faith. For they by no means think it a ſufficient foundation of Faith, that one Age of the Church could not conſpire to deceive another; for this they will tell him, at moſt, is but a humane Faith: but that Chriſt by his Promiſe hath aſſured the Church, that there ſhall never be wanting in it the infallible aſſiſtance of his Holy Spirit, whereby they ſhall infallibly teach and deliver all Matters of Faith. And if this be not their Opinion, let them ſpeak to the contrary, which if they do, I am ſure they muſt retract their moſt elaborate Diſcourſes about reſolution of Faith, written by the greateſt Artiſts among them. Let Mr. *S.* then judge, *who it is that ſtumbles at the Threſhold*; but of this difference among them, more afterwards. By this it appears, it was not any miſtake that I remained unſatisfied with the Queſtion I aſked, *Whether I am bound to believe what the preſent Church delivers to be infallible?* To which Mr. *S.* anſwers, *I underſtand him not.* My reply ſhall be only that of a great *Lawyer's* in a like Caſe, *I cannot help that.* I am ſure my words are intelligible enough; for I take *infallible* there as he takes it himſelf, for *infallibly true*; although I deny not the Word to be improperly uſed in reference to things; and that
P. 204. for the reaſon given by him, *becauſe fallibility and infallibility belong to the knowing Power, or the Perſons that have it, and not to the Object.* But we are often put to the uſe of that Word in a ſenſe we acknowledge improper merely in compliance with our Adverſaries, who otherwiſe are apt to charge us with having only uncertainties and probabilities for our Faith; if we do not uſe the term *infallible* applied to the truth of the thing. I am content therefore wherever, in what I have writ, he meets that term ſo apply'd, that he take it only in his own ſenſe, for that which is *certainly true*; for I mean no more by it. And in this ſenſe Mr. *S.* anſwers affirmatively, and gives this account of it, *not only becauſe the preſent Church cannot be deceived in what the Church of the former Age believed, but becauſe the Church in no Age could conſpire againſt her knowledge to deceive that Age immediately following in Matter of Fact, evident in a manner to the whole World.* The Queſtion then is, Whether this be a ſufficient account for me to believe that to be certainly true, or to be the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, which the preſent Church delivers? and conſequently, whether the reſolution of Faith be barely into Oral Tradition?

§. 3. Thus we ſee the clear ſtate of the Queſtion between us. I come there-

fore

fore to the vindication of thoſe things which I had objected againſt this way of reſolving Faith into Oral Tradition. Three things I eſpecially inſiſted on: 1. That it is inconſiſtent with the pretenſions of the preſent *Roman* Church. 2. That it hath not been the way owned in all Ages of the Chriſtian Church. 3. That it is repugnant to common ſenſe and experience, and that the Church of *Rome* hath apparently altered from what was the belief of former Ages. If theſe three be made good, there will be no cauſe to *glory* in this laſt invention, to ſupport the ſinking fabrick of that Church. Theſe three then I undertake to defend againſt what Mr. *Serjeant* hath objected againſt them.

1. That it is contrary to the pretenſions of the preſent *Roman* Church. And if it be ſo, there can be no reaſon for thoſe who are of it, to rely upon it. For if ſo be that Church pretends, that the obligation to Faith ariſes from a quite different ground from this; how can they who believe that Church infallible, venture their Faith upon any other principle than what is publickly owned by her? And whoſoever thinks himſelf bound to believe by virtue of an infallible aſſiſtance of the preſent Church doth thereby ſhew, that this obligation doth not depend upon what was delivered by the former Ages of the Church. As thoſe who believed the Apoſtles were infallible in their Doctrine, could not reſolve their Faith into the infallibility of Oral Tradition, but into that immediate aſſiſtance by which the Apoſtles ſpoke; and where there is a belief of a like aſſiſtance, the Foundation of Faith cannot lye in the Indefectibility of Tradition, but in that infallible Spirit which they ſuppoſe the Church to be aſſiſted by. For ſuppoſing this oral tradition ſhould fail, and that Men might believe that it had actually failed; yet if the former ſuppoſition were true, there was ſufficient ground for Faith remaining ſtill. And what aſſurance can any one have, that the preſent Church delivers nothing for matter of Faith, but what hath been derived in every Age from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, if ſuch an infallible Spirit be ſuppoſed in the preſent Church which was in the Apoſtles themſelves? For on the ſame reaſon that thoſe who heard the Apoſtles were not bound to trouble themſelves with the tradition of the former Age; no more ought they who believe the preſent *Roman* Church to have the ſame infallible aſſiſtance. They need not then enquire, Whether this Age knew the meaning of the former, or whether one Age could conſpire to deceive another, or whether notwithſtanding both theſe, errors might not come into the Church; it is ſufficient for them, that the definitions of the preſent Church are infallible in all matters of Faith. Therefore my demand was built on very good reaſon; *How can ye aſſure me the preſent Church obliges me to believe nothing but only what, and ſo far as it received from the former Church?* And Mr. *S*'s anſwer is far from being ſatisfactory, *That this appears by her manifeſt practice, never refuſing communion to any Man, that could approve himſelf to believe all the former Age did.* For this may be reſolved into a principle far different from this, which is the belief of the infallibility of the preſent Church. For ſuppoſing, that they are not bound to enquire themſelves into the reaſons why the Tradition could not fail in any Age; it is ſufficent for them to believe the Church infallible; and if it be ſo, in propoſing matters of Faith it muſt be ſo in declaring what the belief of the former Age was. But my demands go on, *What evidence can you bring to convince me both that the Church always obſerved this Rule, and could never be deceived in it?* Which queſtion is built on theſe two Principles which the Infallibility of Oral Tradition

Tradition ſtands on: 1. That the Church muſt always go upon this ground. 2. That if it did ſo, it is impoſſible ſhe ſhould be deceived. Both which are ſo far from that *ſelf-evidence* with Mr. *Serjeant* ſtill pretends to in this way, that the *Jeſuits* principles ſeem much more rational and conſiſtent, than theſe do. For granting them but that one *Poſtulatum*, that there muſt be an inherent Infallibility in the Teſtimony of the preſent Church, to afford ſufficient foundation for Divine Faith, all the reſt of their doctrine follows naturally from it. Whereas this new way of reſolving Faith is built on ſuch ſuppoſitions, which no Man well in his wits will be ready to grant. For unleſs it be *ſelf-evident* that the Church did always proceed on this ground, it cannot be *ſelf-evident* that Oral Tradition is Infallible; becauſe the *ſelf-evidence* of this Principle depends on this, that in all Ages of the Church the only rule and meaſure of Faith, was what was delivered by Oral Tradition from the Age foregoing. Now if it be poſſible, that Matters of Faith might be conveyed in ways quite different from this, what *ſelf-evidence* can there be, that the Church muſt always proceed upon this? Mr. *S.* then, muſt demonſtrate it impoſſible for Matters of Faith to be conveyed to Poſterity in any other way then Oral Tradition; and not only that the thing is impoſſible, but that the Church in all Ages Judged it to be ſo; or elſe he can never make it at all evident, that the Church always made this her rule of Faith. But if either there may be a certain conveyance of Doctrine of Faith another way, *viz.* by writing, or that the Church might Judge that way more certain, whether it were ſo or not, either way it will appear far enough from *ſelf-evidence*, that ſhe always Judged of Doctrines of Faith, merely by the Tradition of the preceeding Age. If another way be granted poſſible, there muſt be clear demonſtration, that the Church notwithſtanding this, did never make uſe of it; for if it did make uſe of another way of reſolving Faith in any Age of the Church, then in that Age of the Church Oral Tradition was not looked on as the ground of Faith; and if ſo, notwithſtanding whatever Mr. *S.* can demonſtrate to the contrary, that Age might have believed otherwiſe than the immediately preceeding did. For let us but ſuppoſe, that all neceſſary Doctrines of Faith were betimes recorded in the Church in Books univerſally received by the Chriſtians of the firſt Ages; is it not poſſible, that Age which firſt embraced theſe Books, might deliver them to Poſterity as the rule of their Faith, and ſo down from one Age to another; and doth it not hence follow, that the Rule of Faith is quite different from a mere Oral Tradition? Let Mr. *S.* then either ſhew it impoſſible, that the Doctrines of Faith ſhould be written; or that being written, they ſhould be univerſally received; or that being univerſally received in one Age, they ſhould not be delivered to the next; or being delivered to the next, thoſe Books ſhould not be looked on as containing the rule of Faith in them; or though they were ſo, yet, that ſtill Oral Tradition was wholly relied on as the Rule of Faith; and then I ſhall freely grant that Mr. *S.* hath attempted ſomething toward the proof of this new *hypotheſis*. But as things now ſtand, it is ſo far from being *ſelf-evident*, that the Church hath always gone upon this Principle, that we find it looked on as a great novelty among them in their own Church; and it would be a rare thing, for a new invention to have been the ſenſe of the Church in all Ages; which if it hath been, the ſtrength of it is thereby taken away.

§. 4. But let us ſuppoſe, that the Church did proceed upon this principle, *that nothing was to be embraced, but what was derived by Tradition from the Apoſtles*; how

how doth it thence follow, that nothing could be admitted into the Church but what was really so derived from them? Do we not see in the World at this day, that among those who own this Principle, contradictory propositions are believed; and both sides tell us, It is on this account, because their Doctrine was delivered by the *Apostles*? doth not the *Greek Church*, profess to believe on the account of Tradition from the *Apostles* as well as the *Latin*? If that Tradition failed in the *Greek Church*, which was preserved in the *Latin*, either Mr. *S.* must instance on his own principles in that Age which conspired to deceive the next, or he must acknowledge, that while Men own Tradition they may be deceived in what the foregoing Age taught them; and consequently those things may be admitted as Doctrines coming from the *Apostles* which were not so, and some which did may be lost, and yet the pretence of Tradition remain still. What *self-evidence* then can there be in this Principle, when two parts of the Church may both own it, and yet believe Contradictions on the account of it; It is then worth our enquiring, what *self-evidence* this is which Mr. *S.* speaks so much of, which is neither more nor less, *but that Men in all Ages had Eyes, Ears, and other Senses, also common Reason, and as much Memory as to remember their own names and frequently inculcated actions.* Which is so very reasonable a *postulatum*, that I suppose none who enjoy any of these will deny it. Let us therefore see how he proceeds upon it. *If you disprove this, I doubt we have lost Mankind, the subject we speak of; and till you disprove it, neither I, nor any Man in his wits can doubt, that this rule depending on testifying, that is, Sense or Experience, can possibly permit Men to be deceivable.* Big words indeed; but such as evidence that all Men who are in their wits do not constantly use them. For I pray, Sir, what doth Mr. *S.* think of the *Greek Church*? Had not those in it, Eyes, Ears, and other Senses, as well as in the *Latin*; Do not they pretend and appeal to what they receive from their *Fore-fathers* as well as the *Latins*? It seems then a deception is possible in the case of testifying, and therefore this doth more *than permit Men to be deceivable*; for there hath been an actual deception on one side or other. But we need not fear *losing Mankind in this*; for the possibility or Error supposeth Mankind to continue still; and if we take away that, we may sooner lose it than by the contrary. But what repugnancy can we imagine to Human Nature, that Men supposing Doctrines of Faith to come down from *Christ* or his *Apostles* should yet mistake in Judging what those Doctrines are? Had not Men Eyes, and Ears, and common Sense in *Christ* and the *Apostles* times? And yet we see even then the Doctrine of *Christ* was mistaken; and is it such a wonder it should be in succeeding Ages? Did not the *Nazarenes* mistake in point of Circumcision, the *Corinthians* as to the Resurrection, and yet the mean time agree in this, that *Christ*'s Doctrine was the rule of Faith, or that they ought to believe nothing but what came from him? Did not the Disciples themselves err, even while they were with Christ, *and certainly had Eyes, and Ears, and common Sense as other Men have*, concerning some great Articles of Christian Faith, *viz. Christ's Passion, Resurrection*, and the *nature of his Kingdom*? If then such who had the greatest opportunities imaginable, and the highest Apprehensions of *Christ*, might so easily mistake in points of such moment, what ground have we to believe, that succeeding Ages should not be liable to such misapprehensions? And it was not merely the want of clear Divine Revelation which was the cause of their mistakes; for these things were plain enough to Persons not possessed with Prejudices; but those were so strong as to make them appre-

P. 205.

hend things quite another way than they ought to do. So it was then, and so it was in succeeding Ages; for let Parents teach what they pleased for Matters of Faith, yet prejudice and liableness to mistake in Children, might easily make them misapprehend either the nature or weight of the Doctrines delivered to them. So that setting aside certain way of Recording the Matters of Faith in the Books of *Scripture*, and these preserved entire in every Age, it is an easie Matter to conceive, how in a short time *Christian Religion* would have been corrupted as much as ever any was in the World. For when we consider how much notwithstanding *Scripture*, the Pride, Passion, and Interests of Men have endeavoured to deface *Christian Religion* in the World, what would not these have done, if there had been no such certain Rule to Judge of it by? Mr. *S.* imagines himself *in repub. Platonis*, but it appears he is still *in fæce Romuli*; he fansies there never were, nor could be any differences among *Christians*, and that all *Christians* made it their whole Business to teach their posterity Matters of Faith, and that they minded nothing in the World but the imprinting that on their minds that they might have it ready for their Children; and that all Parents had equal skill and fidelity in delivering Matters of *Religion* to their posterity. Whereas in truth, we find in the early Ages of the *Christian Church* several differences about Matters of Faith, and these differences continued to Posterity, but all Parties still pleading that their Doctrine came from the *Apostles*; and it fell out unhappily for Mr. *S.* that those were commonly most grosly deceived who pretended the most to Oral Tradition from the *Apostles*; still we find the grand debate was, what came from the *Apostles*, and what not? whereas had Tradition been so Infallible a way of conveying, how could this ever have come into debate among them? What, did not they know what their Parents taught them? It seems they did not, or their Parents were no more agreed than themselves; for their differences could never be ended this way. Afterwards came in for many Ages such a succession of Ignorance and Barbarism, that *Christian Religion* was little minded either by Parents or *Children*, as it ought to have been; instead of that, some sopperies and superstitions were hugely in request, and the Men who fomented these things were cried up as great *Saints* and workers of Miracles. So that the Miracles of *Francis* and *S. Dominick* were as much, if not more carefully conveyed from Parents to Children in that Age, than those of *Christ* and his *Apostles*; and on this account posterity must be equally bound to believe them, and have their Persons in equal veneration. If Men at last were grown wiser, it was because they did not believe Mr. *S.*'s principles, that they ought to receive what was delivered by their Parents; but they began to search and enquire into the writings of former Ages, and to examine the Opinions and practices of the present, with those of the primitive Church, and by this means there came a restauration of *Learning* and *Religion* together.

§. 5. But that Matters of Fact be plain and evident in this Case, yet Mr. *S.* will prove it impossible there should any Errors come into the *Christian Church*; and his main Argument is this, *because no Age of the Church could conspire against her knowledge to deceive that Age immediately following, in Matter of Fact, evident in a manner to the whole World.* But before I come, more particularly, to shew the weakness of this Argument, by manifesting how Errors might come into the Church without such a Conspiracy as this is, I shall propound some *Queries* to him. 1. What Age of the *Church* he will instance in, wherein all Persons who were not cast out of the *Church*, had the same Apprehensions concerning all Points of Faith *i. e.* that none among

among them did believe more things delivered by Christ or the *Apostles* than others did. I am sure he can neither instance in the Age of the *Apostles* themselves, nor in those immediately succeeding them; unless Mr. *S.* the better to defend his *hypothesis*, will Question all written Records, because they consist of *dead letters*, and *unsens'd characters* and *wordish Testimonies*. Never considering, that while he utters this, he writes himself; unless he imagines there is more of *Life*, *Sense*, and *Certainty* in his *Books*, than in the *Scriptures* or any other writing whatsoever. 2. Where there were different Apprehensions in one Age of the Church, whether there must not be different Traditions in the next? For as he looks on all Parents as bound to teach their Children, so on Children as bound to believe what their Parents teach them. On which supposition different Traditions in the succeeding Age must needs follo , different Apprehensions in the precedent. 3 Whether Persons agreeing in the substance of Doctrines may not differ in their Apprehensions of the necessity of them? As for instance, all may agree in the Article of Christ's descent into Hell, but yet may differ in the explication of it, and in the Apprehension of the necessity of it in order to Salvation. So that we must not only in Tradition about Matters of Faith enquire, what was delivered, but under what notion it was delivered; whether as an allowable Opinion, or a necessary Point of Faith. But if several Persons, nay, multitudes in the Church may hhave different notions as to the necessity of the same Points, by what means shall we discern what was delivered as an Opinion in the Church, and what as an Article of Faith? But Mr. *S.* throughout his discourse takes it for granted, that there is the same necessity of believing and delivering all things which concern the Christian Doctrine; and still supposes the same *Sacredness*, *concern*, *necessity* in delivering all the Points in Controversie between the *Romanists* and Us, as there was in those main Articles of Faith, which they and we are agreed in. Which is so extravagant a supposition, that it is hard to conceive it should ever enter into the head of a Person pretending to Reason; but as extravagant as it is, it is that without which his whole Fabrick falls to the ground. For suppose we should grant him, that the infinite concerns which depend on the belief of the *Christian Doctrine* should be of so prevalent nature with the World, that it is impossible to conceive any one Age should neglect the knowing them, or conspire to deceive the next Age about them; yet what is all this to the Matters in difference between us? Will Mr. *S.* prove the same *sacredness*, *necessity*, *concern*, *and miraculously attestedness* (as he phrases it) in the *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, *Supremacy*, &c. as in the believing the Death and Resurrection of the Son of God? If he doth not prove this, he doth nothing; for his Arguments may hold for Doctrines Judged universally necessary, but for no other. Therefore Mr. *S.* hath a new task which he thought not of; which is, to manifest that these could not be looked on as *Opinions*, but were embraced as *necessary Articles of Faith*. For unless he proves them such, he can neither prove any obligation in Parents to teach them their *Children*, nor in *Children* to believe what their *Parents* taught, but only to hold them in the same degree which they did themselves. When Mr. *S.* will undertake to prove, that the whole *Church*, from the time of Christ, did agree in the points in difference betwen us, as necessary Articles of Faith, I may more easily believe, that no Age could be ignorant of them, or offer to deceive the next about them. But when Mr. *S.* reflects on his frequent concession, That there are *private Opinions* in the *Church*, distinct from *matters of*

Faith, he muſt remember, before he can bring home his grounds to the caſe between their *Church* and ours, that he muſt prove none of the things in debate, were ever entertained as *private Opinions*, and that it is impoſſible for that which was a *private Opinion* in one Age, to become a *Matter* of *Faith* in the next.

§ 6. But beçauſe this diſtinction of his ruins his demonſtration, I ſhall firſt propound it in his own terms, and then ſhew how from thence it follows, that Errors may come into the *Church*, and be entertained as matters of Faith. His words are, *It being evident, that we have but two ways of ordinary knowledge, by acts of our Soul, or operations on our Body, that is, by Reaſon and Experience; the former of which belongs to Speculators or Doctors, the ſecond to Deliverers of what was received, or Teſtifiers.* And this diſtinction he frequently admits, not only in the preſent Age of the Church, but in any; for the ſame reaſon will hold in all. From hence I propoſe ſeveral *Queries* farther to Mr. *S.* 1. If every one in the *Church* looked on himſelf as bound to believe juſt as the precedent Age did, whence came any to have *particular Opinions* of their own? For either the *Church* had delivered her ſenſe in that caſe or not; if not, then Tradition is no certain conveyer of the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*; if ſhe had then thoſe who vented private ſpeculations were *Hereticks* in ſo doing; becauſe they oppoſed that doctrine which the *Church* received from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*. If Mr. *S.* replies, *that private ſpeculations are in ſuch caſes where there is no Matter of Faith at all*, he can never be able to help himſelf by that diſtinction in the caſe of his own *Church*; for I demand, Whether it is a *Matter of Faith*, that Men ought to believe Oral Tradition infallible? If not, how can Men ground their Faith upon it? If it be, then either ſome are meer *ſpeculators* in Matters of Faith; or all who believe on the account of the *Pope's Infallibility* are *Hereticks* for ſo doing. 2. If there were *ſpeculators* in former Ages as well as this, whether did thoſe Men believe their own *ſpeculations* or no? If not, then the *Fathers* were great *Impoſtors*, who vented thoſe *ſpeculations* in the *Church* which they did not believe themſelves. And it is plain, Mr. *S.* Speaks of ſuch Opinions which the Aſſerters of, do firmly believe to be true: And if they did, then they looked on themſelves as bound to believe ſomething which was not founded on the Tradition of the *Church*; and conſequently, did not own *Oral Tradition*, as the *Rule* of *Faith*. So that as many *ſpeculators* as we find in the *Church*, ſo many *Teſtifiers* we have againſt the *Infallibility* of *Oral Tradition*. 3. Whether thoſe Perſons who did themſelves believe thoſe Opinions to be true, did not think themſelves obliged to tell others they ought to believe them; and conſequently, to deliver theſe as Matters of Faith to their Children? Let Mr. *S.* ſhew me any inconſequence in this; but that it unavoidably follows upon his principles, that they were bound to teach their Children what themſelves received as the Doctrine of Chriſt; and that the obligation is in all reſpects equal as if they had believed theſe things on the account of *Oral Tradition*. 4. If Children be obliged to believe what their Parents teach them for matters of Faith, then, upon Mr. *S*'s own conceſſions, is not Poſterity bound to believe ſomething which Originally came not from *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*? For it appears in this caſe, that the firſt riſe was from a private Opinion of ſome *Doctors* of the *Church*; But they believing theſe Opinions themſelves, think themſeves Obliged to Propagate them to others; and by reaſon of their Learning and Authority, theſe Opinions may by degrees gain a general acceptance in the ruling

part

part of the *Church*; and all who believe them true, think they ought to teach them their *Children*; and Children they are to believe what their Parents teach them. Thus from Mr. *S*'s *Own Principles*, things that never were delivered by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, may come to be received as matter of Faith in the preſent *Church*. Thus the intelligent Reader needs no body's help but Mr. *S*. to let him underſtand how *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, *&c.* though never delivered either by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, may yet now be looked on as Articles of *Faith*, and yet no Age of the *Church* conſpire to deceive another. Either then Mr. *S*. muſt ſay, there never were any *Private Opiniators* or *Speculators* in the *Church*, as diſtinct from *Teſtifiers*, and then he unavoidably contradicts himſelf; or he muſt deny that Poſterity is bound to Believe what their Fore-fathers delivered them as *Matters of Faith*; which deſtroys the force of his whole demonſtration. Perhaps he will anſwer. *That Children are not bound to believe what barely their Parents, or any other Number of Perſons might deliver as Matters of Faith but what the whole Church of every Age delivers.* This, though the only thing to be ſaid in the caſe, yet is moſt unreaſonable, becauſe it runs Men upon inextricable difficulties in the way of their reſolving Faith. For ſuppoſe any Children taught by their Parents what they are to believe; Mr. *S*. muſt ſay, they are not bound to believe them preſently, but to enquire whether they agree with the whole *Church* of that *Age* firſt, before they can be obliged to aſſent. Which being an impoſſible task either for Children, or Men of Age, to find out in the way of Oral Tradition, this way of reſolving Faith, doth but offer a fairer pretence for Infidelity. For we ſee, how impoſſible it is for Mr. *S*. To make it appear, that their *Church* is agreed about the Rule of Faith; for by his own Confeſſion, the far greater number as *ſpeculators* oppoſe the way aſſerted by him; how much more difficult then muſt it needs be, to find out what the ſenſe of the whole *Eſſential Church* is in all matters which Parents may teach their Children for Doctrines of Faith? So that if Children are not bound to believe what their Parents teach them, till they know they teach nothing but what the whole *Church* teaches, it is the moſt compendious way to teach them, they are not bound to believe at all. But if this Diſtinction be admitted, as Mr. *S*. makes much uſe of it, then it appears, how errors may come into the Church at firſt under the notion of *ſpeculations*, and by degrees to be delivered as points of *Faith*, by which means thoſe things may be received in the *Church*. For ſuch, which were never delivered by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, and yet no Age conſpire to deceive the next which was the thing to be ſhewed.

§. 7. This is one way of ſhewing how *Errors* may come into the *Church*, without one *Ages* conſpiring to deceive the next; but beſides this, there are ſeveral others I might inſiſt upon; but I ſhall mention only two more: 1. Miſ-interpreting the Senſe of *Scripture*. 2. Suppoſing it in the power of ſome part of the *Church* to oblige the whole in matters of Faith. For the *Firſt* we are to conſider, that no imaginable account can be given either of the Writing or Univerſal Reception of the *Books* of the *New Teſtmant*, if they were not deſigned for the preſervation of the Doctrine of *Chriſt*. And although it ſhould be granted poſſible for the Main and Fundamental Articles of Chriſtian Faith (ſuch as the *Apoſtles Creed* gives a Summary Account of) to have been preſerved by the help of Tradition; yet, unleſs we be extremely ungratefull,

we

we cannot but acknowledge, that *God* hath infinitely better provided for us, in not leaving the grounds of our *Religion* to the mere *breath* of the People, or the care of Mothers inſtructing their *Children*, but hath given us the certain records of all the Doctrines and Motives of Faith, preſerved inviolably from the firſt Ages of the *Church*. And when the *Church* ſaw with what care *God* had provided for the means of Faith, *Oral Tradition* was little minded; thence the memory of thoſe other things not recorded in *Scripture* is wholly loſt; all the care was imployed in ſearching, preſerving, and delivering theſe *ſacred Books* to Poſterity. To theſe the primitive *Church* ſtill appeals; theſe they plead for againſt all Adverſaries, defending their Authority explaining their ſenſe, vindicating them from all Corruptions. Tradition they rely not on, any farther than as a Teſtimony of the truth of theſe records, or to clear the ſenſe of them from the perverſe Interpretation of thoſe *Hereticks* who pretended another kind of Tradition than what was in *Scripture*. And when theſe were ſilenced, all the diſputes that aroſe in the *Church* concerning Matters of Faith, were about the ſenſe of theſe Books; as is evident by the proceedings in the caſe of *Arius* and *Pelagius*. Wherein Tradition was only uſed as a means to clear the ſenſe of the *Scriptures*, but not at all as that which the Faith of all was to be reſolved into. But when any thing was pleaded from Tradition, for which there was no ground in *Scripture*, it was rejected with the ſame eaſe it was offered; and ſuch Perſons were plainly told, this was not the *Church's* way; if they had plain Scripture with the concurrent ſenſe of *Antiquity*, they might produce it, and rely upon it. So that the whole uſe of *Tradition* in the primitive *Church* (beſides atteſting the Books) was, to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of impoſing Senſes on *Scripture*, againſt the Univerſal Senſe of the *Church* from the *Apoſtles* times. But as long as Men were Men, it was not avoidable, but they muſt fall into different apprehenſions of the meaning of the *Scripture*, according to their different Judgments, Prejudices, Learning and Education. And ſince they had all this Apprehenſion, that the *Scripture* contained all Doctrines of Faith, thence as Men Judged of the Senſe of it, they differed in their Apprehenſion, concerning Matters of Faith. And thence Errors and miſtakes might eaſily come into the *Church*, without one Age conſpiring to deceive the next. Nay, if it be poſſible for Men to rely on Tradition without *Scripture* this may eaſily be done; for by that means they make a new Rule of Faith, not known to the primitive *Church*, and conſequently, that very aſſertion is an Error in which the former Age did not conſpire to deceive the next. And if theſe things be poſſible, Mr. *S*'s demonſtration fails him; for hereby a Reaſonable Account is given, how Errors may come into a *Church* without one Age conſpiring to deceive another. Again, let me enquire of Mr. *S*. Whether Men may not believe it in the Power of the ruling part of the *Church*, to oblige the whole to an aſſent to the definitions of it? To ſpeak plainer, Is it not poſſible for Men to believe the *Pope* and *Council infallible* in their *decrees?* And I hope the *Jeſuits* (as little as Mr. *S*. loves them, or they him) may be a ſufficient evidence of more than the bare poſſibility of this. If they may believe this, doth it not neceſſarily follow, that they are bound to believe whatever they declare to be Matter of Faith? Suppoſing then, that *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Supremacy*, *Invocation* of *Saints* were but *private Opinions* before but are now defined by *Pope* and *Council*, theſe Men cannot but look on themſelves as much obliged to believe them, as if they had been delivered as Matters of Faith, in every Age ſince the *Apoſtles* times. Is it

now

now repugnant to common Senſe that this Opinion ſhould be believed or entertained in the *Church*? if not, why may not this Opinion be generally received? if it be ſo, doth it not unavoidably follow, that the Faith of Men muſt alter according to the *Church's* definitions? And thus *private Opinions* may be believed as *Articles* of *Faith* and *corrupt Practices* be eſtabliſhed as *laudable Pieces of Devotion*, and yet no one Age of the *Church* conſpire to deceive another. Thus I hope Mr. *S.* may ſee how far it is from being a *ſelf-evident Principle, that no Error can come into the Church, unleſs one Age conſpire to deceive the next in a Matter of Fact, evident in a manner to the whole World.* Which is ſo wild an apprehenſion, that I believe the *Jeſuits* cannot entertain themſelves without ſmiles, to ſee their *Domeſtick Adverſaries* expoſe themſelves to contempt with ſo much confidence.

§. 8. Thus I come to the Reaſon I gave; why there is no Reaſon to believe that this is the preſent Senſe of the *Roman Church*. My words are, *For I ſee the Roman Church aſſerts that things may be* de fide *in one Age, which were not in another; at leaſt Popes and Councils challenge this; and this is the common Doctrine maintained there, and others are looked on as no members of their Church who aſſert the contrary; but as Perſons at leaſt meritoriouſly, if not actually excommunicate. Where then ſhall I ſatisfie myſelf, what the Senſe of your Church is, as to this particular? Muſt I believe a very few Perſons, whom the reſt diſown as Heretical and Seditious? or ought I not rather to take the Judgment of the greateſt and moſt approved Perſons of that Church? And theſe diſown any ſuch Doctrine; but aſſert that the Church may determine things* de fide, *which were not before.* In Anſwer to this Mr. *S. begs leave to diſtinguiſh the words* de fide, *which may either mean Chriſtian Faith, or Points of Faith taught by Chriſt; and then he grants, 'tis nonſenſe to ſay, they can be in one Age, and not in another. Or* de fide *may mean Obligatory to be believed. In this latter Senſe none I think* (ſaith he) *denies things to be* de fide *in one Age and not in another; in the former Senſe none hold it.* Upon which very triumphantly he concludes, *What's now become of your difficulty? I believe you are in ſome wonderment, and think I elude it rather than Anſwer it; I ſhall endeavour to unperplex you.* I muſt confeſs it a fault of Human Nature, to admire things which Men underſtand not; on which account I cannot free myſelf from ſome temptation to that he calls *wonderment*; but I am preſently cured of it, when I endeavour to reduce his diſtinction to reaſon. For inſtead of explaining his Terms, he ſhould have ſhewed how any thing can be obligatory to be believed in any Age of the *Church*, which was no Point of Faith taught by *Chriſt*, which notwithſtanding his endeavour to *unperplex me*, is a thing as yet I Apprehend not; becauſe I underſtand no obligation to Faith to ariſe from any thing but *Divine Revelation*; and I do not yet believe any thing in *Chriſtian Doctrine* to be divinely revealed, but what was delivered by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*. And my *wonderment* muſt needs be the greater; becauſe I ſuppoſe this inconſiſtent with Mr. *S*'s principles. For Oral Tradition doth neceſſarily imply, that all Points of *Faith* were firſt taught by *Chriſt*, and conveyed by Tradition to us; but if a thing may be *de fide* in this latter Senſe, which was not before, what becomes of reſolving Faith wholly into *Oral Tradition*? For *Faith* is *reſolved* into that from whence the *obligation* to *believe* comes; but here Mr. *S.* confeſſes, that the obligation to believe doth ariſe from ſomething quite different from *Oral Tradition*; and therefore Faith muſt be reſolved into it. Beſides, all the Senſe I can find in that diſtinction, is, that Men are bound to believe ſomething in one Age, which they were not in another; and if ſo, I ſhall deſire Mr. *S.* to *unperplex me* in this, how every Age is bound to believe juſt as the precedent did, *P.* 205.

did, and yet one Age be bound to believe more than the precedent. But however, I am much oblige to him for his endeavour to *unperplex me*, as he ſpeaks; for really I look on no civilities to be greater than thoſe which are deſigned for clearing our underſtandings; ſo great an adorer am I of true Reaſon and an intelligible Religion. And therefore I perfectly agree
P. 206. with him in his ſaying, *that Chriſtianity aims not to make us Beaſts, but more perfectly Men; and the perfection of our manhood conſiſts in the uſe of our Reaſons.* From whence he infers, that it is reaſonable, conſequences ſhould be drawn from principles of Faith, *which*, he ſaith, *are of two ſorts; firſt ſuch as need no more but common Senſe to deduce them; the others are ſuch as need the Maxims of ſome ſcience got by ſpeculation to infer them; and theſe are Theological concluſions: The former ſort*, he tells us, *the Church is neceſſitated to make uſe of upon occaſion*, i. e. *when any Heretick queſtions thoſe*, *and* eadem opera, *the whole Point of Faith itſelf, of which they were a part; as in the Caſe of the* Monothelities, *about Chriſt's having two Wills.* But all this while; I am far enough from being *unperplexed*; nay by this diſcourſe, I ſee every one who offers to *unperplex* another, is not very *clear* himſelf. For ſince he makes no *Theological concluſions* to be *de fide*, but only ſuch *conſequences as common Senſe draws*, I would willingly underſtand how *Common Senſe* receives a new Obligation to Faith. For to my Apprehenſion the deducing of conſequences from principles by *common Senſe*, is not an act of believing, but of knowledge conſequent upon a Principle of Faith. And the meaning is no more than this, That Men, when they ſay they believe things, ſhould not contradict themſelves, as certainly they would do, if they deny thoſe *conſequences* which *common Senſe* draws from them. As in the Caſe of the *Monothelities*, for Men to aſſert, that *Chriſt* had *two Natures*, and yet not *two Wills*; when the will is nothing elſe but the inclination of the *nature* to that *good* which belongs to it. So that there can be no diſtinct Obligation to believe ſuch *conſequences* as are drawn by common Senſe; but every one that believes the *Principles* from whence they are drawn, is thereby bound to believe all the conſequences which immediately follow from them. Indeed the *Church*, when People will be ſo unreaſonable to deny ſuch things, may explain her Senſe of the Article of Faith in thoſe Terms which may beſt prevent diſpute; but this is only to diſcriminate the Perſons who truly believe this Article, from ſuch as do not. Not that any new Obligation to Faith reſults from this act of the *Church*; but the better to prevent cavils, ſhe explains her Senſe of the Article itſelf in more explicite Terms. *Which*, as he ſaith, *is only to put the Faith out of danger of being equivocated.* Which is quite another thing from cauſing a new obligation to believe. As ſuppoſe the *Church*, to prevent the growth of the *Socinian Doctrine*, ſhould require from Men the declaring their belief of the *eternal exiſtence* of the *Son* of *God*; Would this be to bind Men to believe ſomething which they were not bound to before? No, but only to expreſs their aſſent to the *Deity* of Chriſt in the ſimpleſt Terms; becauſe otherwiſe they might call him *God* by *Office*, and not by *Nature*. Now how can any one conceive, that any ſhould be firſt obliged to believe, that *Chriſt* is *God*, and yet receive a new Obligation afterwards to believe his *eternal exiſtence?* Thus it is in all *immediate conſequences* drawn by *common Senſe*; in all which the primary obligation to believe the thing itſelf, extends to the belief of it in the moſt clear and leaſt controverted Terms, which are not intended to impoſe on Mens Faith, but to promote the *Church's* peace. For neither is there a new object of Faith; for how can that be, which common Senſe draws from what is believed already? neither is there any *infallible propo-*

nent,

nent, unleſs *common Senſe* hath uſurped the *Pope's* Prerogative. But Mr. *S.* offers at a reaſon for this, which is, *that none can have an Obligation to believe what they have not an Obligation to think of*; *and in ſome Age the generality of the Faithful have no occaſion, nor conſeqnently Obligation to mind, reflect, or think on thoſe propoſitions involved in the main ſtock of Faith. From whence*, he ſaith, *it follows, that a thing may be* de fide, *or obligatory to be believed in one Age, and not in another.* But let Mr. *S.* ſhew, how a Man can be obliged to believe any thing as an Article of Faith, who is not bound to think of all the immediate conſequences of it? Becauſe Faith is an Act of a reaſonable Nature, which ought to enquire into the reaſons and conſequences of things which it doth believe. But Mr. *S*'s miſtake lies here, in not diſtinguiſhing the Obligation to believe from the Obligation to an explicit declaration of that aſſent. The former comes only from God, and no new Obligation can ariſe from any Act of the *Church*; but the latter being a thing tending to the *Church's* Peace, may be required by it on ſome Occaſions; *i. e.* when the Doctrine is aſſaulted by *Hereticks*, as in the time of the *four Firſt General Councils*; but ſtill a Man is not at all the more obliged to Aſſent, but to Expreſs his Aſſent in order to the *Church's* Satisfaction.

But Mr. *S.* ſuppoſes me to enquire, *how the Church can have Power to oblige the generality to belief of ſuch a Point.* To which his Anſwer is, *ſhe obliges them to believe the main Point of Faith, by virtue of Traditions, being a ſelf-evident Rule, and theſe implied Points by virtue of their being ſelf-evidently connected with thoſe main and perpetually uſed Points, ſo that the vulgar can be rationally and connaturally made capable of this their Obligation.* But we are not now enquiring, what the Obligation to believe the main Points of Faith is, nor whether Tradition be a *ſelf-evident Rule*; but how there ſhould be *a new Obligation to believe ſomething ſelf-evidently connected with the former Points*, is beyond my capacity to underſtand. And they muſt be *vulgar underſtandings* indeed, that can *rationally and connaturally* be made capable of ſuch an Obligation. For if it be ſelf-evidently connected with the main Points, no one can believe the one, without believing the other; for nothing is *ſelf-evident*, but what a Man Aſſents to at the firſt Apprehenſion of it; and if he doth ſo, how comes there a new Obligation to believe it? Is it poſſible to believe, that any thing conſiſts of *parts*, and not believe that *that whole is greater than any of thoſe parts*? for this is a thing *ſelf-evidently connected* with the nature of the *whole*. But theſe are *ſelf-evident Riddles*, as the former were *unintelligible demonſtrations*. And yet, though theſe be rare *Theories*, the Application of them to the caſe of the *Roman Church* exceeds all the reſt. *Whence*, ſaith he, *the Government of our Church is ſtill juſtified to be ſweet, and according to right nature, and yet forcible and efficacious.* Although I admire many things in Mr. *S*'s Book, yet I cannot ſay I do any thing more than this paſſage, that *becauſe Men are obliged to believe no implied Point, but ſuch as are ſelf-evidently connected with the main ones*, therefore *the Government of the Roman Church is ſweet, and according to right nature*, &c. Alas then, how much have we been miſtaken all this while, that have charged her with impoſing hard and unſufferable conditions of communion with her! No, ſhe is ſo gentle and ſweet, that ſhe requires nothing *but the main Points on the account of a ſelf-evident rule, and implied Points by reaſon of ſelf-evident connexion with the former.* I ſee Mr. *S.* (if he will make good his word) is the only Perſon who is ever like to reconcile me with the *Church* of *Rome*: For I aſſure you, I never deſire any better Terms of Communion with a *Church*, than to have no main Points of

§. 9. P. 208.

Faith required from me to Aſſent to, but what are built on a *ſelf-evident Rule*, nor any implied Points but ſuch as are *ſelf-evidently connected* with the former. And no work can be more eaſie, than to convince me upon theſe grounds; for all endeavours of proof are taken away by the things being ſaid to be *ſelf-evident*. For the very offer of proof that they are ſo, *ſelf-evidently* proves they are not ſo: For what ever is proved by ſome thing beſide itſelf, can never be ſaid without a contradiction to be *ſelf-evident*. But not to tye up Mr. *S.* from his excellent faculty of proving, if Mr. S. will prove to me that any of the Points in difference between us, as *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Supremacy* of the *Roman Church*, &c. have any *ſelf-evident connexion* with any main Point of Faith in the *Apoſtles Creed*, I ſolemnly Promiſe him to retract all I have writ againſt that *Church*; ſo far ſhall I be from needing a new Obligation to believe them. But if theſe be ſo remote from *ſelf-evidence*, that they are plainly repugnant to Senſe and Reaſon, (witneſs that ſelf-evident Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation) what then muſt we think of Mr. *S.*? Surely the leaſt is, that ſince his being a *Roman Catholick*, his mind is ſtrangely enlightened, ſo far that thoſe things are *ſelf-evident* to him, which are contradictions to the reſt of the World. But withall Mr. *S.* acquaints us with another Myſtery; which is, *how theſe Points deſcended by a kind of Tradition*, and yet confeſſes, *they were never thought of or reflected on by the generality, till the Church took occaſion to explain them*. Such a *ſilent Tradition* doth very ſuitably follow the former *ſelf-evident connexion*. For he that can believe *Tranſubſtantiation* to be *ſelf-evident*, no wonder if he believes that to have been delivered by a *conſtant Tradition*, which was never heard of from the *Apoſtles times* to *theſe*.

Now Mr. *S.* is pleaſed to return to me, and draws up a freſh charge againſt me, which is, *that I act like a Politician, and would conquer them by firſt dividing them, and making odious compariſons between two Parties of Divines. But to ſhew us how little they differ, he diſtinguiſhes them, as faithfull, and as private diſcourſers; in the former notion*, he ſaith, *they all hold the ſame divinely conſtituted Church-Government, and the ſame ſelf-evident Rule of Faith; but as private Diſcourſers he acknowledges they differ in the explication of their belief*. I meddle not here with the *Government* of their *Church*, (which I have elſewhere proved to be far enough from being *divinely conſtituted*) but with the *Rule of Faith*; and the Queſtion is, Whether the *infallibility* of *Oral Tradition*, be that *ſelf-evident Rule* which that *Church* proceeds on; *Yes*, ſaith Mr. *S. they are all as faithfull agreed in it, but as diſcourſers they differ* about it. Which in ſhort is, that all in the *Church* of *Rome*, who are not of his Opinion, know not what they ſay; and that they oppoſe that which they do really believe. Which in plain *Engliſh* is, that they are egregious diſſemblers and prevaricators in *Religion*, that they do intolerably flatter the *Pope* and *preſent Church* with loud declamations for their Infallibility, but they do really believe no ſuch thing, but reſolve all into Oral Tradition. But is not this an excellent Agreement among them, when Mr. *White* and his party not only diſown the common Doctrine of the Infallibility of *Pope* and *Councils*, but diſpute againſt it as pernicious and deſtructive to *Chriſtian Faith*? on the other ſide the far greater part of *Romaniſts* ſay, there can be no certainty of Faith, unleſs there be an *Infallible* Divine Teſtimony in the *preſent Church*, and this lodged in *Pope* and *Councils*; that thoſe who endeavour to overthrow this, are *Dangerous*, *Seditious*, *Heretical* Perſons. Accordingly their Books are cenſured at *Rome*, their Opinions diſputed againſt, and their Perſons condemned. And yet all this while, we muſt believe that *theſe* ſtick together like two ſmooth Marbles *as faithfull*, though they

they are knocked one againſt another *as Diſcourſers*; and that they perfectly agree in the ſame *ſelf-evident Rule* of *Faith*, when all their Quarrels and Contentions are about it; and thoſe mannaged with ſo great heat, that *Hereſie* is charged of one ſide, and *Arch-hereſie* and *undermining Religion* on the other. Doth he think we never heard of Mr. *White*'s *Sonus Succinæ*, nor of that *Chapter* in it, where he ſaith, *That the Doctrine of Pope and Councils Infallibility tends to overthrow the certainty of Chriſtian Faith; and that the Propagating ſuch a Doctrine is a greater Crime than Burning Temples, Raviſhing the Sacred Virgins on the Altars, Trampling on the Body of Chriſt, or the ſending the Turk or Antichriſt into Chriſtian Countries?* Or doth he think we can believe that the *Pope* and *Cardinals*, the *Jeſuits* and all the *Papiſts* of foreign Countries do *as Faithfull* agree with Mr. *White* in this? It ſeems not ſo by the proceedings in the *Court* of *Rome* againſt him, in which as appears by the Cenſure of *Inquiſition* againſt him, dated the 17*th* of *November* 1661. His Doctrine is Condemned not only as *Falſe*, *Seditious* and *Scandalous*, but as *Heretical* and *Erroneous* in *Faith*. And if it were not for this very Doctrine he was there Cenſured, why doth Mr. *White* ſet himſelf purpoſely to defend it in his *Tabulæ Suffragiales?* If theſe then do agree as Faithfull, who cannot but envy the excellent Harmony of the *Roman Church*, in which Men condemn each other for *Hereticks*, and yet all believe the ſame things ſtill? Well, Sir, I am in hopes upon the ſame grounds Mr. S. will yield us the ſame Charity too, and tell us, that we agree with him as Faithfull, only we differ a little from him as Diſcourſers; for I aſſure you, there is as great Reaſon: the only Difference is, we give them not ſuch *Ill words* as they do each other. For let Mr. *S.* ſhew us wherein we differ more from him about the *Rule* of *Faith*, than they do among themſelves: For Mr. *White* when he hath ſaid, *That all kind of Hereſie doth ariſe from hence, that Men make the Holy Scripture, or a private Spirit, the Rule of Faith*; he preſently adds, *It is all one, if one make Councils or Pope any other way than as Witneſſes to be the Authors of Faith For*, ſaith he, *This is to ſubject the whole Church to that Slavery, to receive any Error for an Article of Faith, which they ſhall define, or propoſe* modo illegitimo, i. e. *Any other way than as Witneſſes of Tradition.* Either then we differ from Mr. *S.* only as Diſcourſers, or he and his Brethren differ from each other more than as ſuch. And ſo any one would think who Reads the Oppoſitions and Arguments againſt each other on this Subject, particularly Mr. *Whites Tabulæ ſuffragiales.* But let Mr. *White* ſay what he will Mr. *S.* tells me, *I am not aware how little they differ even as Divines.* The more ſhame for them to have ſuch Furious Heats and Oppoſitions where there is ſo little difference. But as little as they differ, Mr. *White* thinks it ſafer to talk of their unity in *England*, than to try whether they be of his mind at *Rome*, by going thither to clear himſelf; For he juſtly fears he ſhould find them differ from him ſome other way than *as bare Diſcourſers.* Yet let us hear Mr. *S*'s reaſon; *for*, ſaith he, *Though ſome Speculators attribute to the Church a Power of Defining things not held before, yet few will ſay ſhe hath new Revelations or new Articles of Faith.* But we know the temper of theſe Men better than to rely on what they barely ſay. For they ſay what they think is moſt for their purpoſe; and one of Mr. *White*'s Adverſaries, (if himſelf may be credited) plainly told him, *If the Doctrine of the Popes Infallibility were not true, yet it ought to be defended, becauſe it was for the Intereſt of the Church of* Rome: For which he is

ſufficiently rebuked by him. It is one thing then what they ſay, and another what neſſarily follows from the Doctrine which they aſſert. But for plain dealing commend me to the *Canoniſts*, who ſay expreſly, The *Church* (by which they mean the *Pope*) may make *New Articles of Faith*: And this is the Senſe of the reſt, though they are loth to Speak out. Elſe Mr. *White* was much to blame in ſpending ſo much Time in promoting the contrary. But what Man of Common Senſe can Imagine that theſe Men can mean otherwiſe, who aſſert ſuch Infallibility in *Pope* and *Councils*, as to oblige Men under pain of Eternal Damnation to Believe thoſe things which they were not obliged to, before ſuch a Definition? And what can this be elſe but to make new Articles of Faith? For an Article of Faith ſuppoſes a neceſſary Obligation to Believe it: Now if ſome Doctrine may become thus Obligatory by Virtue of the *Church's* Definition which was not ſo before, that becomes thereby an Article of Faith which was not before. But theſe Subtile Men have not yet learn'd to diſtinguiſh a *New Article of Faith*: they do not indeed pretend that their Doctrine is New, becauſe they deny any ſuch thing as new Revelation in the *Church*; but yet they muſt needs ſay, if they underſtand themſelves, that Old implicit Doctrines, may become new Articles of Faith by virtue of the *Church's* definition. So little are they relieved by that ſilly diſtinction *of explicit and implicit delivery* of them, which Mr. *S.* for a great Novelty acquaints us with. For what is only *implicitely delivered*, is no Article of Faith at all: for that can be no Article of Faith, which Men are not bound to believe; now there are none will ſay that Men are bound to believe under pain of Damnation if they do not, the things which are only implicitly delivered; but this they ſay with great confidence of all things defined by the *Church*. And let now any intelligent Perſon judge; whether thoſe who aſſert ſuch things, do not differ wide enough from thoſe who reſolve all into *Oral Tradition*, and make the Obligation to Faith wholly dependant upon the conſtant Tradition of any Doctrine from Age to Age ever ſince the *Apoſtles* times.

§. 11. But Mr. *S.* is yet farther diſpleaſed with me for ſaying, *That Pope and Councils challenge a Power to make things* de fide *in one Age, which were not in another*. For 1. he ſays, *I ſpeak it in common, and prove it not*. 2. He adds, *That take them right, this is both perfectly Innocent, and unavoidably neceſſary to a Church*. And is it not ſtrange he ſhould expect any particular proofs of ſo innocent and neceſſary a thing to the being of a *Church*? But he will tell me, it is in his own Senſe of *de fide*, which I have already ſhewn to ſignifie nothing to his purpoſe. Let him therefore ſpeak out, whether he doth believe any ſuch thing as inherent Infallibility in the definitions of *Pope* and *Councils*? if not, I am ſure at *Rome* they will never believe that Mr. *S.* agrees with them *as faithful*; if he doth, whether doth not ſuch an Infallible definition bind Men by virtue of it to the belief of what is then defined? if it doth, then things may become as much *de fide* by it, as if they were delivered by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*. For thereby is ſuppoſed an equal Obligation to Faith, becauſe there is a propoſition equally Infallible. But will he ſay, the *Pope* doth not challenge this? Why then is the contrary Doctrine Cenſured and Condemned at *Rome*? Why is the other ſo eagerly contended for, by the moſt Zealous Sons of that *Church*, and that not as a *School-opinion*, but as the only certain *Foundation* of *Faith*? Mr. *S.* is yet pleaſed to inform me farther, *that nothing will avail me but this, if a Pope and Council ſhould define a new thing, and declare they ground themſelves on*

New

New Lights, as did their first Reformers in England: *but I shall find*, he saith, *no such Fopperies in Faith-definitions made by the Catholick Church.* Is this the Man who made choice of Reason for his weapon? could there be a greater Calumny cast on our *Church*, than to say, *her Reformers grounded themselves on new Lights?* when our great charge against the *Church* of *Rome* is for introducing *Novelties*, and receeding from pure and primitive Antiquity. Whether the charge be true or no, yet sure it follows they did not declare *they ground themselves on new lights*, but expresly the contrary. Well, *but Pope and Councils neither define new things, nor ground themselves on them:* but what means the Man of Reason? that they make no new definitions: surely not; for then what did they meet for? and what mean their Decrees but he intends, that they deliver no new Doctrine: but how must that be tried? or hath Mr. *S.* gained the Opinion of Infallibility both from *Pope* and *Councils*, that we must believe his bare word? but we not only say but prove that even their last *Council* hath defined many things, which never were delivered by *Christ* or his *Apostles*. And it is to no purpose whether they say *they ground themselves on new Lights*, or pretend to an *Infallible assistance*; for it comes all to the same at last. For if the assistance be infallible, what matter is it whether the Doctrine hath been revealed or no? for on this supposition it is impossible that *Pope* and *Council* should miscarry. Therefore if any *Church* be guilty of *Fopperies* in Faith-definitions, it must be that which you miscall *the Catholick*, but is more truly known by the Name of the *Roman Church*. There is yet one piece of Mr. *S*'s sagacity to be taken notice of as to this particular, which is, *that I am at an end of my Argument, because I say the Opinion of the Pope and Councils Infallibility is the common Doctrine maintained: in which I confound the Church with the Schools, or some private Opiniators, and then carp at those Men's Tenets.* And this is the force of all that Paragraph, He tells me, *I want not Wit to know that no sober Catholick holds human deductions the Rule of their Faith, Schoolmen definers of it, nor the Schools the Tribunal whence to propose it Authoritatively and Obligingly to the generality of the Faithfull.* Neither doth Mr. *S.* want the wit to know that our present Inquiry is concerning the Sense of their present Church about the Rule of Faith. Since then Mr. *S.* must confess it necessary to Faith to know what the certain Rule of it is; let me inquire farther, whether any particular Person can know certainly what it is, unless he knows what the *Church* owns for her Rule of Faith; and whether that may be owned as the *Church's* Judgment, which is stifly opposed by the most interessed Persons in the *Roman Church*, and the most zealous contenders for it? Especially when the *Pope* who is said to be *Head* of the *Church*, condemns the Doctrine asserted, and that only by a small number of such who are as much opposed by themselves, as by any of us. Is it then possible to know the *Church's* Judgment or not? if not, 'tis to no purpose to search for a *Rule* of *Faith*: if it be, which way can we come to know it, either by most *Voices* or the Sense of the *Governors* of the *Church*: either of the ways, I dare put it to a fair tryal whether *Oral Tradition*, or the *Infallibility* of *Pope* and *Councils* be the Doctrine most owned in the *Church* of *Rome*? But Mr. *S.* still tells us, *These are only private Opiniators and Schoolmen who assert the contrary Doctrine to his.* But will not they much more say on the other side, that this way of *Oral Tradition* is a Novel Fancy of some few *half Catholicks* in *England*, and tends to subvert the *Roman Church*. But is the present *Pope* with Mr. *S. a private Opiniator*, or was the last a *mere Schoolman?* I am sure what ever Mr. *S.* thinks of him, he thought not so of himself when he said, *he was no Divine* in the

controversie

Controverſie of *Janſenius*. Doth the *Court* of *Rome* ſignifie no more with Mr. *S.* than a Company of *ſcholaſtick Pedants* that know not what the Senſe of the *Church* is, concerning the rule of Faith? I meddle not with the *Schools* but with the Authority of the *preſent Church*, and him whom Mr. *S.* owns for the *Head* of it: and is it conſiſtent with his *headſhip* to condemn that Doctrine which contains in it the only certain *rule* of *Faith*? Mr. *S.* may then ſee they were no ſuch impertinent *Topicks* which I inſiſted on, and as ſtout as Mr. *S.* ſeems to be, I am apt to believe he would not look on the cenſure of the *Inquiſition* as an impertinent *Topick*.

§. 12. But at laſt Mr. *S.* offers at ſomething whereby he would ſatisfie me of the Senſe of the *Church*, as to this particular, and therefore asks, *Whether I never heard of ſuch a thing as the Council of* Trent? I muſt ingenuouſly confeſs I have; and ſeen more a great deal of it, than I am ſatisfied with. But what of that? *there*, he tells me, *I may find a clear ſolution of any doubt by the conſtant procedure of that moſt grave Synod in it's definitions.* That is, I hope to find that Oral Tradition was acknowledged there as the only *ſelf-evident* rule of Faith. If I do this, I confeſs my ſelf ſatisfied in this enquiry. But how much to the contrary is there very obvious in the proceedings of it? For in the 4th *Seſſion* the Decree is, *That Scripture and Tradition ſhould be embraced with equal Piety and reverence*; and the Reaſon is, *becauſe the Doctrine of Faith is contain'd partly in Scripture, partly in Tradition*; but what Arts muſt Mr. *S.* uſe to infer from hence, that *Oral Tradition* in contradiſtinction to *Scripture* was looked on as the only rule of Faith? I cannot but ſay, that the ruling Men of that *Council* were Men wiſe enough in their *Generation*; and they were too wiſe wholly to exclude *Scripture*; but becauſe they knew *that* of itſelf could not ſerve their purpoſes, they therefore help it out with *Tradition*, and make both together the *complete rule of Faith*. Where I pray in all the proceedings of that *Council* doth Mr. *S.* find them define any thing on the Account of *Oral Tradition*? Inſtead of which we find continual bandyings about the Senſe of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, which might have been all ſpared, if they had been ſo wiſe as to conſider, they could not but know the Senſe of the *preſent Church*, not that of the precedent, and ſo up to the time of *Chriſt*. But they were either ſo ignorant as not to light on this happy invention; or ſo wiſe and knowing as to deſpiſe it. It is true, they would not have their Doctrines looked on as *novelties*, therefore they ſpeak much of *Tradition* and the *Ancient Faith*; but that was not by what their *Parents* taught them, but what the *Fathers* of the *Church* delivered in their writings; for by theſe they Judged of *Traditions*, and not the *Oral* way. And therefore I ſee little Reaſon to believe, that this was either the Senſe of the *Council* of *Trent*, or is the Senſe of any number of *Roman Catholicks*, much leſs *of the whole Church*, *none excepted*, as Mr. *S.* in his confident way expreſſes it. *And if he will*, as he ſaith, *diſavow the maintaining any Point, or affecting any way which is not aſſented to by all.* I hope to ſee Mr. *S.* retract this Opinion, and either fall in with the *Court* of *Rome*, or return, as reaſon leads him, into the boſom of the *Church* of *England*. But there ſeems to be ſomewhat more in what follows, *viz. that though Schoolmen Queſtion the Perſonal Infallibility of the Pope, or of the Roman Clergy, nay of a General Council, yet all affirm the Infallibility of Tradition, or the living voice of the Church eſſential; and this*, he ſaith, *is held by all, held firmly*, and *that it is abſolutely Infallible.* To this therefore I anſwer, either Mr. *S.* means that none do affirm that the *univerſal Tradition* of the *Church eſſential* can err, or that the *Church* of *Rome*, being the *Church Eſſential*, connot err in her Tradition: But which

P. 212.

way

way ſoever he takes it, I ſhall eaſily ſhew how far it is from proving that he deſigns it for. For if he take it in the firſt Senſe, *viz.* that *all the faithfull* in *all Ages* could not concur in an Error, then he may as well prove *Proteſtants* of his mind as *Papiſts*, for this is the Foundation on which we believe the particular Books of *Scriptnre*. If this therefore proves any thing, it proves more than he intends, *viz.* that while we thus oppoſe each other, we do perfectly agree together; and truly ſo we do, as much as they do among themſelves. But if Mr. *S*'s meaning be, *that all of their Religion own the Roman Church to be the Church eſſential, and on that account, that it cannot err*, (ſetting aſide the abſurdity of the Opinion it ſelf,) I ſay from hence it doth not follow, that they make *Oral Tradition* the rule of *Faith*, becauſe it is moſt evident, that the ground why they ſay their *Church* cannot err, is not on Mr. *S*'s *Principles*, but on the ſuppoſition of an *Infallible aſſiſtance*, which preſerves that *Church* from Error. So that this falls far ſhort of proving, that they are all agreed in this Rule of Faith; which is a thing ſo far from probability, that he might, by the ſame argument prove, that *Scripture* is owned by them all to be the Rule of Faith. For I hope *it is held by all*, and *held firmly*, that the living voice of *God* in *Scripture*, as delivered to us, is *Infallible*; and if ſo, then there is as much ground for this as the other. But if we enquire what it is Men make a *Rule* of *Faith*, we muſt know not only that they believe *Tradition Infallible*, but on what account they do ſo. For if Tradition be believed *Infallible* barely on the account of a promiſe of *Infallibility* to the *preſent Church*, then the Reſolution of Faith is not into the *Tradition*, but into that *Infallible aſſiſtance*; and conſequently the Rule of Faith is not, what bare Tradition delivers, but what that *Church*, which cannot err in Judging Tradition, doth propoſe to us. It is not therefore their being agreed in *General, that Tradition is Infallible*, doth make them agree in the ſame *Rule* of *Faith*; but they muſt agree in the ground of that *Infallibility*, *viz.* That it depends on this, *That no Age ſhould conſpire to deceive the next*. But all Perſons who underſtand any thing of the *Roman Church*, know very well that the general Reaſon why Tradition is believed Infallible, is, becauſe they firſt believe the *Church* to be *Infallible*; whereas Mr. *S.* goes the contrary way, and makes the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, to depend on the *Infallibility* of *Tradition*. And therefore, for all that I can ſee, we muſt ſtill oppoſe *private Opiniators* in this Controverſie; the *Church* of *Rome*, not having declared her ſelf at all on Mr. *S*'s behalf, but the contrary, and the generality believing on the Account of the preſent *Church's* Infallibility. And it is ſtrange Mr. *S.* ſhould find no difference between Mens reſolving Faith in common Senſe, and into the Immediate aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*. If this then *be the firſt Principle of Controverſie*, as Mr. *S.* pretends, we ſee how unlikely they are to agree about other Matters, who are ſo much divided about the Principle of reſolving them. And if this be the ground of Faith, then moſt *Romaniſts* build on a wrong Foundation. But if the *Infallibility of Oral Tradition* be the Foundation on which *that formidable ſtructure is erecting*, which he ſpeaks of, wo then to the *Court* of *Rome*, for that is known to build on quite a different Foundation. And *if this*, as he ſaith, *Riſes apace, and has advanced many ſtories in a ſmall time*, it only lets us know how faſt their diviſions grow, and that they are building ſo faſt one againſt another, that their *Church* will not ſtand between them. By this Diſcourſe, Mr. *S.* pretends *To Anſwer all thoſe If's which follow*; which are theſe, *In Caſe the Church may Determine things* de fide, *which were not before, whether the preſent Church doth then believe as the precedent did or no? if* P. 213.

if

it did, how comes any thing to be de fide *which was not before? if it did not, what assurance can I have that every Age of the Church believes just as the precedent did, and no otherwise; When I see they profess the contrary? And if a thing may be* de fide *in one Age, which was not in a foregoing, then a Church may deliver that as a Matter of Faith at one time, which was never accounted so before; by which means the present Church may oblige me to believe that as a Matter of Faith, which never was so in Christ's or the Apostles times, and so the Infallibility on the account of Tradition is destroyed.* To all which Mr. *S.* gives a very easie Answer, *viz. that they do not hold any disparate or unimplied Points of Faith; but such as are involved and implied in the main Point.* This is no more easily said than understood; for if these be implied in the former, how can there come a new Obligation to believe them? For to take his own Instance, will any Man in his Senses say, that he that believes *homo est animal rationale*, doth not believe *homo est animal?* And this he makes choice of as an example, *how one Point of Faith may be involved in another, so as to receive a distinct Obligation to believe it.* I grant that *homo est animal* is involved in the other, but he that shall say, that after he hath assented to that Proposition, *homo est animal rationale*, he may be capable of a new Obligation to believe the former, which is involved in this, it may be justly Questioned whether such an one, as to himself, can truly say, *homo est animal rationale*, or no. But after such rare subtilties, he doth very well to tell me, *That I ought to consider what Logick tells us, that the Conclusion is in the Premisses, which Reflection* (in his court-like expression) he saith, *will much unblunder my Thoughts.* But let the conclusion be as long as it will in the *Premisses*, will any Man in his wits say, that he that believes the *Truth* of the *Premisses*, is not hereby bound to believe the Conclusion? and the more the one is involved in the other, the less is it possible to make the Obligation to believe them distinct. And it is hard for me to believe, that this is a way *to unblunder my thoughts*, when I see what horrible Confusion such expressions argue in his own. Let the *Church* then clear her thoughts never so much, yet all this cannot amount to a distinct Obligation to believe those things which were involved before, but to a more explicit declaring them for the *Church's* Peace and Satisfaction. The only Conclusion then involved in these Premisses, is, that if some things may be *de fide* in one Age which were not in another, then the present Age may believe otherwise than the precedent did. And if this Doctrine be held in the *Church* of *Rome*, nothing can be more evident, than that Mr. *S*'s *first Principle of Controversie*, is far from being the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, which was the thing to be proved.

P. 214.

§. 13. My second chief Argument against the way of *Oral Tradition* was, *that it had not been owned in all Ages of the Christian Church*; to manifest which, I enquired into the Reason of the Obligation in any Age of the *Church* to Believe and Practise just as the precedent did. Mr. *S.* rejoices in that Confession of mine, *That only thing to be proved in this Case is, that every Age of the Church, and all Persons in it, look'd on themselves as obliged not to vary in any thing from the Doctrine and Practice of the Precedent Age.* And I there offer the Choice of three ways to prove it, *Reason*, *Testimony*, or *Tradition*; he tells me, *he excepts the way of Reason*; yet quarrels with me for pressing for a *Demonstrative medium* to prove it, when yet Mr. *S.* seldom speaks under the rate of *Demonstrations.* But he thereby notes *the unconsonancy of my Carriage*, Wherein I wonder? That I should desire them to perform this Promise, *viz.* to give us *Demonstrations* for the grounds of Faith? But saith withall, *he will yield me the Honour of professing I have no Demonstration*

but

but probability for the ground of mine, and he makes this ſerious Proteſtation for himſelf, that he ſhould eſteem himſelf very diſhoneſt, did he aſſert and preſs on others any Argument for the ground of his Faith, which he judged not evident, that is Demonſtrative. What is it theſe Men mean when they cry up their own way for *Demonſtrative*, and ſay that we build our Faith merely on *Probabilities?* Do they ſay, that *Religion* is capable of ſtrict and rigorous *Demonſtration*? If ſo, let them demonſtrate the *Being* of *God* and *Immortality* of the *Soul*, with as much evidence, as *that the three Angles of a triangle are equal to two right Angles.* And it is ſtrange, if they think *Particular Problems* in Religion are more capable of *Demonſtration* than thoſe *Theorems* on which they are built. But by all the enquiry I can make, all the difference between us is, that Mr. *S.* will have that called a *Demonſtration*, which is ſcarce a *Probability*; and we call that *ſufficient Reaſon*, which any wiſe Man may ſafely rely on in Matters of *Religion.* In the mean time how much do we ſuffer by our modeſty, that becauſe we ſpeak not as big as Mr. *S.* does, we muſt be cenſured preſently to have nothing but *Probabilities* for our Faith? Are thoſe bare *probabilities* which leave no ſuſpicion of doubt behind them? And ſuch we freely aſſert the grounds of our Religion to do; *i. e.* I aſſert, that we have the higheſt Actual certainty of the truth of our *Religion*, which the mind of any reaſonable Man can deſire; and if Mr. *S*'s *Demonſtrations* can do any more than this, let him tell us what it is. For my part, I know nothing higher in the mind of Man than a *certain aſſent*, and if I did not think there was the greateſt ground in *Religion* for that, I abhor diſſimulation ſo much, that I ſhould leave off perſuading Men to embrace it. And if any Men have made us ſhy of the word *Demonſtration* and *Infallibility*, they are ſuch Men as Mr. *S.* have done it, who talk of theſe things, when their Arguments fall beneath ſome of the remoteſt *probabilities* we inſiſt on. Nay, if there be any force in his *Demonſtration*, as to Matter of Fact, it hath been uſed by us long before his Book ſaw the light. But we love to give the true Names to things, and not to loſe our Credit with all intelligent Perſons, by playing *Mountebanks* in *Religion*, crying up thoſe things, for *Infallible Cures*, which an ordinary capacity may diſcern the inſufficiency of. But was it any thing but Juſtice and Reaſon in me to expect and call for a *Demonſtration* from them who talk of nothing under it? And therefore I ſaid, *that it was Impoſſible to demonſtrate this way of Oral Tradition, unleſs it were proved impoſſible for Men not to think themſelves obliged to believe and do all juſt as their Predeceſſors did.* For where the contrary is not only poſſible, but eaſily ſuppoſable, as that Men may believe thoſe things, as new Articles of Faith which are defined by *Pope* and *Council*, I wonder how Mr. *S.* will Demonſtrate, that Men muſt look on themſelves as obliged to believe juſt as their Predeceſſors did? For I had thought Demonſtrations had never place in contingent Propoſitions; but it ſeems Mr. *S.* who tells me, *Logick will unblunder my thoughts*, intends to make a new one for me. And I aſſure you ſo he had need, before I ſhall ever call his Arguments Demonſtrations: and although he thinks himſelf *very honeſt* in calling them ſo, yet I ſhould think him much *wiſer* if he did not.

But before I come to the particular debate of theſe things, I freely tell him, that I grant all he requeſts; I ſhall *take along with me the Nature of the Matter in Hand, the Doctrines and Practices ſpoken of, the manner of delivering them, the neceſſary Circumſtances which give weight to both*; yet for all theſe, I cannot look on his way as *Demonſtrative.* And that both our meanings may be better underſtood, it is very neceſſary the Reader ſhould have a

§. 14. P. 236.

true account of the ſtate of the Queſtion between us. And if he will be-
P. 217. lieve me, I never intended to diſpute with him or any one elſe, *whether Men were bound to wear their Clothes, or build houſes, or manage Eſtates juſt as their predeceſſors did*; but whether every Age is obliged to believe and Practice juſt as the precedent did, by virtue of mere *Oral Tradition*; for about that is all the Controverſie between us. I do not deny, but a ſucceeding Age may look on itſelf as bound to believe what the precedent did; but whether that Obligation doth ariſe purely from the delivery of that Doctrine by the precedent in the way of *Tradition*, is the thing in diſpute between us. For in caſe the ground of Faith be wholly the written Word, conveyed from Age to Age, I deny not but an Obligation to believe deſcends with the Doctrine to every ſucceeding Age. But that which Mr. *S.* is to prove is, *That abſtractly from Scripture every Age is abſolutely bound to believe juſt as the precedent did*, without any enquiry Whether that Doctrine doth agree with *Scriptures* or no; but that he is therefore bound to believe all which is propoſed to him, becauſe it was the Doctrine of the immediately preceeding Age. And this is that which I deny, and deſire Mr. *S.* to prove. For which he firſt gives us a large inſtance in Hiſtorical Matters, and then comes to the Matters of *Chriſtian Faith*. His inſtance is *in* Alexander's *Conqueſt of* Aſia, *as to which*, he ſaith,
P. 218. *That the Memory of it is freſh and lively, though ſome thouſand years ſince; and that the univerſal and ſtrong perſuaſion of this Matter of Fact was not cauſed by Books, as* Curtius *his Hiſtory, but by Human Tradition; that the continuance if this perſuaſion was the notoriety of the Fact to the then livers, which Obliged them to relate it to their Poſterity, and that this teſtifying by the Fore-fathers, was that which Obliged Poſterity to believe things, as true, becauſe there could be no Imaginable Motive why the whole World ſhould conſpire to deceive them, or be deceivable in their ſenſations; on which Principle it paſſed to the next Age, and ſo came down by way of Tradition to our days; and the Obligation to believe in every Age depended upon this, that the Senſes of the firſt could not be deceived; and having this ſecurity in every Age, that no one would conſpire to deceive the next, it follows that no Age could ſay a former Age teſtified ſo, unleſs it did; ſo therefore,* ſaith he, *it follows Demonſtratively, that it was teſtified; and ſo the deſcendants in every Age to the very end of the World have the ſame Obligation to believe their Immediate Fore-fathers, ſaying it was teſtifyed by theirs, and ſo to the very firſt, who were witneſſes of his Actions.* This is the ſubſtance of what he more
P. 223. largely Diſcourſes in ſeveral Paragraphs; which when he hath done, he tells me, *he expects what I will reply to this Diſcourſe.* Not to fruſtrate therefore his expectation and in order to the Readers Satisfaction, we are to conſider, that in the preſent Caſe there are two diſtinct Queſtions to be reſolved: 1. How a *Matter* of *Fact* evident to the World comes to be conveyed to Poſterity? 2. By what means a complete Hiſtory of all paſſages relating to it may be conveyed? As to the firſt, I grant that a *Fact* ſo Notorious as *Alexander*'s Conqueſt of *Aſia* might have been preſerved by Human Tradition, and conveyed in a certain way from one Age to another. But if we enquire into that which is alone proper to our Queſtion, *viz.* by what means we may Judge what is *true* and *falſe* as to the *particulars* of that *Conqueſt*, then I deny that bare *Tradition* is to be relyed on in this Caſe. For the certainty of conveyance of all particulars doth depend not upon the *bare Veracity*, but the *Capacity* and *Skill* of *Communicating* from one Age to another. For which one would think we need no clearer Evidence than the Conſideration of the different account of former *times* in the ſeveral Nations of the World. For who can imagine, but the

barbarous

barbarous Nations were as unwilling to deceive their Posterity as any other? yet we see a vast difference in the *Histories* of former *Ages* among them, and more civilized People. And I wish Mr. *S.* would rather have instanced in some History which had been preserved merely by Tradition, and not in such a one, which, if any other, hath been most carefully recorded and propagated to Posterity. If Mr. *S.* would have undertaken to have told us, who they were that first Peopled *America*, and from what place they came, by the *Tradition* of the present Inhabitants, and what Famous Actions had been done there in former Ages, we might have thought indeed, that *sole Tradition* had been a very safe way to convey Matters of Fact from one Age to another. But since all Mr. *S*'s Arguments will hold as well for the *Scythians* and *Americans*, and the most barbarous Nations, as the most civil and polite; what Reason can Mr. *S.* give, why there is not among them as certain an account of former Ages, as among the *Greeks* and *Romans*? Were not their *Senses*, who saw those Matters of Fact, as uncapable of being *deceived* as others? Was not every Age among them as unwilling to deceive their Posterity as elsewhere? Yet notwithstanding the force of Mr. *S*'s Demonstration, we see for want of *letters* how grosly Ignorant they are of what was done before them. And if this Principle were true, why have we not as true an account of the *eldest* Ages of the World, as of any other? Nay, why were *Letters* invented, and writing ever used, if Tradition had been found so Infallible? But it is one thing superficially to Discourse what is Impossible should be otherwise, and another to consider what really hath been in the World. Doth not the constant experience of all times prove, that where any *History* hath not been timely recorded, it hath been soon corrupted by Notorious Falsities, or obscured by Fabulous Reports? As we see among ourselves, what difference there is in Point of certainty between the several stories of K *Arthur* and *William* the *Conqueror*; what will Mr. *S.* say, that those who lived in K. *Arthur*'s time could not know what he did, or that they conspired to deceive their Posterity? but if Tradition be so *Infallible*, why have we not the ancient story of *Britain* as exact as the modern? If Mr. *S.* will impute it to the *Peoples Ignorance, want of Letters, frequent Conquests* by other Nations, and *succeeding barbarism*, he may easily find how many ways there are for *Matters of Fact* to be soon lost or corrupted, when they have not been diligently preserved by Authentick Records; and that without one Age conspiring to deceive another. But notwithstanding Mr. *S*'s confidence, I cannot think it possible for Mr. *S.* to believe, that we should have had as true an account of *Alexander's Conquest of Asia*, if *Arrian*, *Curtius*, or *Plutarch* had never writ his story, as we have now. Yet this he must Assert by virtue of his Principle. And he that can believe that, I wonder he should scruple believing the *Pope's Infallibility*; for certainly no Principle of the *Jesuits* is more wild and absurd than this is. Besides, I admire how it came into Mr. *S*'s Head to think, no Error could come into History *unless one Age conspired to deceive another*, when we find no Age agreed in the present Matters of *Fact* which are done in it, as to the grounds and particulars of them; to give Mr. *S.* an Instance home to his purpose, in the late *Council* of *Trent* we see already what different representations there are made of it in so little a time as hath already passed since the sitting of it. One, though he had all the Advantages imaginable of knowing all proceedings in it, living at the same time, conversing with the Persons present at it, having the *Memoires* and records of the *Secretaries* themselves, yet his story is since endeavoured to be blasted by a great Per-

ſon of the *Roman Church*, as fictitious and partial. We ſee then it is at leaſt ſuppoſed that Intereſt and Prejudice may have a great hand in abuſing the World in Matter of ſtory, though one Age never agree to deceive another. And inſtead of being perſuaded by Mr. *S*'s Demonſtrations, I am ſtill of the mind, that we have no ſufficient ſecurity of the truth of any ſtory, which was not written while thoſe Perſons were in being who were able to contradict the Errors of it. However I deny not, but ſome Notorious Matters of Fact, ſuch as *Alexander's* bare *Conqueſt* of *Aſia*, might by the viſible Effects of it be preſerved both in *Aſia* and *Greece* for a long time. But if we come to enquire particularly, whether this or that was done by him in his Conqueſt, which is alone pertinent to our purpoſe, we
P. 213. have no ſecurity at all from Tradition, but only from the moſt Authentick records of that ſtory. And by this, I hope Mr. *S.* will have cauſe to thank me for *unblundering his thoughts* (his own civil expreſſions,) and ſhewing him how Errors may come into a ſtory without one Age conſpiring to deceive the next; and what a vaſt difference there is between preſerving a bare Matter of Fact, and all the particulars relating to it. And hereby he may eaſily ſee how far the Obligation extends in believing the report of former Ages. For there can be no Obligation to believe any farther than there is evidence of truth in the Matter we are Obliged to. If then there be not only a poſſibility, but a very great probability of miſtakes and Errors in Matter of Fact, I pray what Obligation doth there lye upon Men abſolutely to believe what is delivered by the preceeding Age? But to put an iſſue to this Controverſie, let Mr. *S.* examine himſelf, and try if he can name one ſtory that was never written, which was ever certainly Propagated from one Age to another by mere Oral Tradition; and if he cannot, he may thereby ſee how little real force his Argument hath in the World. For all the Force of Tradition lies in an unqueſtionable conveyance of thoſe *Books* which contain in them the true reports of the Actions of the times they were written in. But can Mr. *S.* think, that if the *Roman Hiſtory* had never been written, it had been poſſible for us to have known what was done under the *Kings* and *Conſuls* as now we do? Yet if his Principle holds, this neceſſarily follows; for *thoſe of that Age could not but know them*, and *no Age ſince could conſpire to deceive the next*. And from hence, the moſt uſeful conſequence of all is, that Mr. *S.* might have writ a Hiſtory from the beginning of the World to this day, with a full relation of all *particulars*, if there had never been any *Book* written in the World before. And doth not Mr. *S.* deſerve Immortal Credit for ſo rare an invention as this is, and all built on nothing ſhort of *Demonſtrations*?

§. 15. *P.* 224. But Mr. *S.* very prudently *foreſees*, *what it is I muſt be forced to recur to*, viz. *that being baffled with his former Demonſtration, I have no other ſhift to betake my ſelf to, but to ſay the Caſe is different between Hiſtories and Points of Faith.* And therefore to bring his buſineſs home, he applies it at large to the delivery of the *Chriſtian Faith*, which that he might do in more ample ſort, he very finely deſcants on the old *Verſe*, *Quis*, *quid*, *ubi*, *&c.* containing the Circumſtances of Human Actions, and from every one of them derives Arguments for the *Infallibility* of *Oral Tradition*; which briefly and in plain *Engliſh* may be ſummed up thus; *Since the Author of this Doctrine was the Son of God, the Doctrine itſelf ſo excellent, and delivered in ſo Publick a manner, in the moſt convincing way, by Miracle and good Living, and for ſo good an end as to ſave Men's Souls, and that by writing it in Men's Hearts, and teſtified to others; and all this at a time when Men might judge of the Miracles*

and

and Motives for believing it; therefore ſince in all theſe reſpects it was incomparably beyond the ſtory of Alexander's *Conqueſts, it follows, that in a manner infinitely greater muſt the Obligation be to believe Chriſt's Doctrines, than* Alexander's *or* William *the Conqueror's Victories, or any Hiſtory of the like nature whatſoever.* All which I freely grant, but cannot yet ſee how from thence it follows; that *Oral Tradition is the only Rule of Faith*, or the means whereby we are to judge what is the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*, and what not. Thoſe Arguments I confeſs prove, that the *Chriſtians* of the firſt Age were highly concerned to enquire into the truth of theſe things, and that they had the greateſt Reaſon imaginable to believe them; and that it is not poſſible to conceive that they ſhould not endeavour to propagate ſo excellent a Doctrine, and of ſo high concernment to the World. But the Queſtion is, whether abſtractly from the *Books* written in the firſt Age of the *Chriſtian Church*, there is ſo much Infallibility in the *Oral Tradition* of every Age, that nothing could be embraced for Chriſt's Doctrine which was not; and conſequently, whether every Age were bound to believe abſolutely what was delivered it by the Precedent for the Doctrine of *Chriſt*? Mr. *S.* therefore puts himſelf to a needleſs task of proving that every Age was bound to believe the *Doctrine of Chriſt*, which I never Queſtioned; but the diſpute is, whether every Age be bound on the account of *Oral Tradition* to believe what is delivered by the Precedent for *Chriſt's Doctrine*. But it is to be Obſerved all along how carefully Mr. *S.* avoids mentioning the *written Books* of the *New Teſtament*; becauſe he knew all his game about Oral Tradition would be quite ſpoiled by a true ſtating the Matter of Fact in the firſt Ages of the *Chriſtian Church*. I hope he will not be angry with me, for asking him that Queſtion about the *Scripture*, which he asks me about the *Council* of *Trent*; *Did he never hear of ſuch a thing as the Scripture? or is it ſo hard to find it?* But if he hath heard of it, I intreat him to reſolve me theſe *Queſtions*: 1. Whether he doth not believe, that the Books of the *New Teſtament* were written at ſuch a time, when the Matters of Fact therein Recorded, were capable of being throughly examined? which he cannot deny upon his own Principle; for Tradition being then Infallible as to the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*, the writers of theſe Books cannot be conceived to deliver it amiſs, unleſs they reſolved to contradict the preſent Tradition of the *Church*; which if they had done, thoſe Books could never have found any reception among *Chriſtians*. If Tradition then convey the Doctrine of Chriſt infallibly, theſe Books muſt convey it infallibly, becauſe they contain in them the Infallible Tradition of the firſt Age of the *Chriſtian Church*; and were written at the time when many Perſons living had been able to diſprove any thing contained therein repugnant to truth. And that theſe Books were written by thoſe Perſons whoſe Names they bear, I appeal to Mr. *S*'s own Rule, *Tradition*; for if that be Infallible in any thing, it muſt be in this; And if one Age could conſpire to deceive another in a Matter of ſuch concernment, what ſecurity can be had, that it may not do ſo in all other things? 2. Whether he believes, that thoſe whoſe intention was to write an account of the Life, Actions, and Doctrine of *Chriſt*, did leave any thing out of their Books which did relate to them as of concernment for us to believe? For upon Mr. *S*'s Principles, any one may eaſily know what the Tradition of the *Church* is; and eſpecially ſuch certainly who were either preſent themſelves at the Matters of Fact, or heard them from thoſe who were; and what Satisfaction can any one deſire greater than this? But the Queſtion is, whether this Teſtimony were not more ſafely depoſited in the *Church* to be conveyed by

word

word of mouth, than it could be by being committed to writing by ſuch who were Eye and Ear witneſſes of the Actions and Doctrine of Chriſt? Upon which I advance ſome farther *Queries*. 3. If Oral Tradition were the more certain way, why was any thing written at all? It may be Mr. *S.* will tell us, *for moral Inſtructions, and to give precepts of good Life*; but then why may not theſe be as Infallibly conveyed by Tradition as Doctrines of Faith? And why then were any Matters of Fact and Points of Faith inſerted in the Books of the *New Teſtament?* By which it certainly appears, that the intention of writing them was to preſerve them to Poſterity. Let Mr. *S.* tell me whether it was conſiſtent with the wiſdom of Men, much leſs with the Wiſdom of an *Infinite Being* to imploy Men to do that which might be far better done another way, and when it is done can give no Satisfaction to the minds of Men? 4. Whether thoſe things which are capable of being underſtood when they are ſpoken, ceaſe to be ſo when they are written? For Mr. *S.* ſeems to underſtand thoſe terms of a *Living voice*, and *dead Letters* in a very ſtrict and rigorous manner; as though the Senſe were only *quick* when ſpoken, and became buried in *Dead letters*. But Mr. *S.* ſeems with the ſagacious *Indian* to admire how it is poſſible for *dead Letters* and *unſens'd Characters* to expreſs Mens meanings as well as words. I cannot enter into Mr. *S*'s Apprehenſion, how 24 Letters by their various diſpoſition can expreſs Matters of Faith? And yet to increaſe the wonder, he writes about Matters of Faith, while he is proving that Matters of Faith cannot be conveyed by writing. So that Mr. *S*'s own writing is the beſt Demonſtration againſt himſelf; and he confutes his own *Sophiſtry* with his fingers, as *Diogenes* did *Zeno*'s by his motion. For doth Mr. *S.* hope to perſwade Men, that Tradition is a Rule of Faith by his Book or not? If not, to what purpoſe doth he write? If he doth, then it is to be hoped ſome Matters of Faith may be intelligibly conveyed by writing; eſpecially if Mr. *S.* doth it. But by no means we are to believe that ever the *Spirit* of *God* can do it. For whatever is written by Men aſſiſted by that, is according to him but a heap of *Dead Letters*, and *Inſignificant Characters*; when Mr. *S.* the mean while is full of *Senſe* and *Demonſtration*. Happy Man that can thus out-do Infinite Wiſdom, and write far beyond either *Prophets* or *Apoſtles*. But if he will condeſcend ſo far as to allow that to inſpired Perſons which he confidently believes of himſelf, *viz.* that he can write a Book full of *Senſe*, and that any ordinary Capacity may Apprehend the deſign of it, our Controverſie is at an end; for then Matters of Faith may be intelligibly and certainly conveyed to Poſterity by the Books of *Scripture*; and if ſo, there will be no need of any recourſe to *Oral Tradition*. 5. If the Books of *Scripture* did not certainly and intelligibly convey all Matters of Faith, what made them be received with ſo much Veneration in the firſt Ages of the *Chriſtian Church?* which were beſt able to Judge of the truth of the Matters contained in them, and the uſefulneſs of the Books themſelves. And therein we ſtill find, that Appeals were made to them, that they thought themſelves concerned to Vindicate them againſt all Objections of Heathens and others; and the Reſolution of Faith was made into them, and not Tradition, as I have already manifeſted, and muſt not repeat.

Part. 1. chap. 9. 6. Whether it be in the leaſt credible, ſince the Books of *Scripture* were ſuppoſed to contain the Doctrines of Faith, that every Age of the Church ſhould look on itſelf as Obliged abſolutely to believe the Doctrine of the Precedent by virtue of an Oral Tradition? For ſince they reſolved their Faith into the written Books, how is it poſſible they ſhould believe on the account

account of an Oral Tradition? Although then the *Apoſtles* did deliver the Doctrine of Chriſt to all their Diſciples; yet ſince the Records of it were embraced in the Church, Men Judged of the truth or falſhood of Doctrines, by the conveniency or repugnancy of them to what was contained in thoſe Books. By which we underſtand, that the Obligation to believe what was taught by the Precedent Age, did not ariſe from the Oral Tradition of it, but by the ſatisfaction of the preſent Age, that the Doctrine delivered by it, was the ſame with that contained in *Scripture*.

§. 16. It is time now to return to Mr. *S.* who proceeds ſtill to manifeſt *this Obligation in Poſterity to believe what was deliver'd as matter of Faith, by the Precedent Age of the Church*; but the force of all is the ſame ſtill; *viz. that otherwiſe one Age muſt conſpire to deceive the next.* But the inconſequence of that, I have fully ſhewed already, unleſs he Demonſtrates it impoſſible for Errors to come in any other way: For if we reduce the ſubſtance of what he ſaith to a Syllogiſtical form, it comes to this; Where there is no poſſibility of Error, there is an abſolute Obligation to Faith; but there is no poſſibility of Error in the Tradition of any Age of the *Church*: *ergo* in every Age there is an abſolute Obligation to believe the Tradition of the preſent *Church*. The *minor* he thus proves; If no Age of the *Church* can be Ignorant of what the Precedent taught, or conſpire to deceive the next, then there is no poſſibility of Error coming into the Tradition of the *Church* in any Age; but the Antecedent is true, and therefore the conſequent. Now, who ſees not that the force of all this lies not in proving the *minor Propoſition*, or that no Age could conſpire to deceive another? but the conſequence, *viz.* that no Error can come into a *Church*, but by a general miſtake, in one whole Age, or the general impoſture of it which we utterly deny; and have ſhewed him already the falſeneſs of it from his own conceſſions. And I might more largely ſhew it from thoſe Doctrines or Opinions which they themſelves Acknowledge to have come into their Church without any ſuch general miſtake or Impoſture, as the *Doctrines* of *Papal Infallibility*, and the common belief of *Purgatory*. The very ſame way that Mr. *White* and Mr. *S.* will ſhew us how theſe came in, we will ſhew him how many others came in as Erroneous and Scandalous as thoſe are. For whether *they* account theſe Matters of Faith or no, it is certain many among them do, and that the far greateſt number, who aſſert and believe them to be the Doctrine of their *Church* too. If therefore theſe might come in without one Age miſtaking or deceiving the next, why might not all thoſe come in the ſame way which we charge upon them as the Errors of their *Church*? And in the ſame manner that Corrupt Doctrines come in, may Corrupt Practices too, ſince *theſe*, as he ſaith, *ſpring from the other*. He might therefore have ſaved himſelf the trouble of finding *out how an accute Wit, or great Scholar would diſcover the weakneſs of this way.* For without pretending to be either of theſe, I have found out another way of Attacking it, than Mr. *S.* looked for; *viz.* from his own Principles and Conceſſions; ſhewing how Errors might come into a Church, without a total Deception or Conſpiracy in any one Age. Which if it be true, he cannot bind me to believe whatever he tells me the preſent Church delivers, unleſs he can prove that this never came into the Church as a Speculation or private Opinion, and from thence by degrees hath come to be accounted a Point of Faith. Therefore his way of proof is now quite altered, and he cannot ſay we are bound to believe whatever the preſent Church delivers; for that which he calls the preſent Church, may have admitted Speculations and private Opinions into Doctrines

P. 229, &c.

P. 231.

ctrines of Faith; but he muſt firſt prove ſuch Doctrines delivered by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, and that from his time down to our Age they have been received by the whole Church for Matters of Faith; and when he hath done this, as to any of the Points in Controverſie between us, I will Promiſe him to be his *Proſelyte*. But he ought ſtill to remember, that he is not to prove it impoſſible for one whole Age to conſpire to deceive the next; but that ſuppoſing that it is impoſſible for any Errors to come into the Tradition of the Church. Let us now ſee what Mr. *S.* Objects againſt thoſe words I then uſed againſt the Demonſtrating this way; *It is hard to conceive what Reaſon ſhould inforce it, but ſuch as proves the impoſſibility of the contrary; and they have Underſtandings of another mould from others, who can conceive it impoſſible Men ſhould not think themſelves obliged to believe and do all*
P. 234. *juſt as their Predeceſſors.* And whatever Mr. *S.* ſays to the contrary, I cannot yet ſee, but that therein I argued *from the very nature and conſtitution of the thing*. For that which I looked for, was a *Demonſtration*, which I ſuppoſed could not be unleſs the impoſſibility of the contrary were Demonſtrated. But if it be poſſible for Men, *Chriſtians*, nay *Romaniſts*, to believe on other accounts than Tradition of the Precedent Age, I pray what Demonſtration can there be, that Men muſt think themſelves obliged to believe and do all juſt as their Predeceſſors did? Surely if Mr. *S*'s Fancy had not heen very extravagant, he could never have thought here of *Mens being obliged to cut their Beards, or wear ſuch Garters and Hat-bands as their Fore-fathers did.* For do not I mention *believing firſt, and then doing?* by which it were eaſie to Apprehend, that I meant Matters of Faith, and ſuch Practices as flow from them. Neither was there any ſuch *Crafty*
P. 235. *and Sophiſtical Dealing* as he charges me with; for I am content his Doctrine be taken in his own terms; and I have now given a larger and fuller Account why I am far from being convinced by the way he hath uſed for reſolving Faith. Paſſing by therefore his challenge, which I accept of, as long as he holds to the *Weapon* of *Reaſon* and *Civility*, I come
P. 236. to conſider his laſt enquiry, *why I ſhould come to doubt of ſuch an Obligation in Poſterity, to believe their Anceſtors in Matters of Faith*; and he judiciouſly
P. 237. reſolves it into *a ſtrange diſtortion of Human Nature*, but ſuch as it ſeems is the proper effect of the *Proteſtants Temper, which is*, ſaith he, *to chuſe every one his Faith by his private Judgment, or Wit, working upon diſputable words.* Which as far as we own it, is not to believe what we ſee no ground for; and if this be ſuch a *diſtortion of Human Nature*, I envy not Mr. *S*'s Uprightneſs and Perfection. If he means that we build our Faith on our private Judgments, in oppoſition to *Scripture*, or the *Univerſal Tradition* of the *Church* in all Ages, let him prove it evidently in one particular, and I engage for my ſelf and all true *Proteſtants*, we will renounce the belief of it. If he hath any thing farther to object againſt the grounds of our Religion, he knows where to Attack me; let him undertake the whole, or elſe acknowledge it a moſt unreaſonable thing thus to charge Falſities upon us, and then ſay we have nothing elſe to ſay for ourſelves. We pretend not to chuſe our Faith, but heartily embrace whatever appears to have been delivered by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*; but we know the *Church* of *Rome* too well to believe all which ſhe would impoſe upon us, and are loth to have her chuſe our Religion for us, ſince we know ſhe hath choſen ſo ill for herſelf. But if Mr. *S.* will not believe me in ſaying thus, what Reaſon have I to believe him in ſaying otherwiſe? Such general charges then ſignifie nothing, but every one muſt Judge according to the Reaſon on both ſides.

I now come to the laſt part of my task; which is to ſhew, *that this way is repugnant to common Senſe and Experience, and that the* Church *of* Rome *hath apparently altered from what was the belief of former Ages.* To which purpoſe my words are, *It is to no Purpoſe to prove impoſſibility of motion when I ſee Men move; no more is it to prove that no Age of the Church could vary from the Preceding, when we can evidently prove that they have done it. And therefore this Argument is intended only to catch eaſie Minds that care not for a ſearch into the Hiſtory of the ſeveral Ages of the Church, but had rather ſit down with a ſuperficial Subtilty, than ſpend time in farther enquiries.* But *two things* Mr. *S.* tells me *are required e'er I can ſee that their Faith varies from the former;* P. 238. *firſt to ſee what their Church holds now, and then to ſee what the former Church held before; and he kindly tells me, if he ſees any thing, I ſee neither well.* It ſeems I want Mr. *S*'s *Spectacles* of Oral Tradition to ſee with; but as yet I have no cauſe to complain of the want of them, but I ſee much better without them than with them. He tells me, *I cannot ſee what their preſent Church holds, and therefore I cannot aſſure any what was held before; becauſe, if I renounce Tradition, I take away all means of knowing. The Reaſon why I cannot candidly ſee* (as he phraſes it) *what their Church holds now, is, becauſe I cannot diſtinguiſh between Faith and its Explication, ſome Schoolmen and the Church.* By which it ſeems it is impoſſible for me to know what their Church holds concerning *Invocation of Saints, Worſhip of Images, Communion in one kind*; for thoſe are the Points I there mention, wherein it is evident, that the *Church* of *Rome* hath receeded from the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church. Or are theſe only the Opinions and Practices of ſome *Schoolmen* among them, and not the Doctrine and Practice of their *Church*? But we might come to ſome fuller ſtate of theſe Controverſies, I wiſh Mr. *S.* would ſettle ſome ſure way whereby we might know diſtinctly what are the Doctrines and Practices of their Church. If the *Council* of *Trent* and *Roman Catechiſm* be ſaid to be the Rule of *Doctrine*, I deſire no other; ſo that thoſe may be interpreted by Practices univerſally allowed among them. As when that *Council* only defined, that *due Honour be given to Saints*; the general Practice of that *Church* may tell us what they mean by that *due Honour*; and if that be not fair, I know not what is. But I ſee all the ſhift Mr. *S.* hath, is, when he is pinched, to ſay *theſe are the Opinions of Schoolmen and private Speculators, and not the Doctrine of their Church.* And if ſuch ſhifts as theſe are muſt ſerve the turn, I ſhould wonder if ever he be to ſeek for an Anſwer. But the ſhorteſt Anſwer of all would be, that none but thoſe of their Church can know what ſhe holds; and therefore it is to no purpoſe for *Proteſtants* to write againſt her; or it may be, that none but Mr. *S.* and one or two more can tell; for many among them ſay, thoſe are the Doctrines of their *Church* which they deny to be. So that except Mr. *White* and Mr. *S.* and ſome very few *Demonſtrators* more, all the reſt are *Schoolmen, private Opiniators*, and not to be relied on. *But I cannot ſee what their Church held formerly neither.* P. 236. No wonder at all of that; for if I cannot ſee an Object ſo near me as the preſent *Church*, how can it be expected I ſhould ſee one ſo much farther off as the Doctrine of former Ages? And his reaſon is ſo ſtrong, as may well perſwade me out of one, at leaſt, of my Five Senſes. *For*, ſaith he, *if I Queſtion Tradition, I Queſtion whether there be any Doctrine delivered, and ſo any Fathers.* And is not this argued like a Demonſtrator? Firſt he ſuppoſes there never was any way uſed in the World but Oral Tradition, and then ſtrongly infers, if I deny that, I can know nothing. But I can yet hardly perſwade my ſelf that the *Fathers*

only ſate in Chimney-Corners teaching their Children by word of Mouth, and charging them to be ſure to do ſo to theirs; but as they loved preſerving the Doctrine of Faith, they ſhould have a great care never to write down a word of it. But why, I wonder, ſhould Mr. *S.* think, that if I do not allow of Oral Tradition, I muſt needs Queſtion whether there were any *Fathers*? I had thought I might have known there had been *Fathers* by their *Children*? I mean the *Books* they left behind them. But if all Mr. *S.* pleads for be only this, that no *Books* can be certainly conveyed without Tradition, he diſputes without an Adverſary; but as I never oppoſed this, ſo I am ſure it doth him little ſervice. It is then from the Books of the *Fathers* that I find what the Senſe of the *Church* of their Age was, and from thence I have ſhewed how vaſtly different the Opinions and Practices of the *Roman Church* are from thoſe of the *Primitive*. Although then I may not think myſelf obliged to believe all that the preſent *Church* delivers for matter of Faith; yet I hope I may find what the Opinions and Practice of the former *Church* were by the Records that are left of it. And the Reaſon why I cannot think any one obliged to believe what every Age of the *Church* delivers, is, becauſe I think no Man obliged to believe Contradictions; and I ſee the Opinions and Practices of ſeveral Ages apparently contrary to each other.

§. 18. Well, but I call this way a *Superficial Subtilty*; and ſo I think it ſtill; ſo little have Mr. *S*'s Demonſtrations wrought upon me. *But*, ſaith he, *is that which is wholly built on the nature of things Superficial?* No; but that which pretends to be ſo built, may. And of that nature I have ſhewed this way to be, and not the former. But that I may not think him *Superficial* as well as his way, he puts a profound Queſtion to me, *What do I think Controverſie is?* and that he may the better let me know what it is, he Anſwers himſelf. *I deal plainly with you*, ſaith he, *you may take it to be an Art of Talking, and I think you do ſo, though you will not profeſs it; but I take it to be a Noble Science.* But to let him ſee that I will deal as plainly with him, as he doth with me, I will *profeſs* it, that I not only think *Controverſie* as uſually managed, but ſome Mens way of Demonſtrtaing (Mr. *S.* may eaſily know whom I mean) to be a mere *Art of Talking*, and nothing elſe. But *he takes it to be a Noble Science*; yes doubtleſs, if Mr. *S.* manage it, and he be the judge of it himſelf. His meaning I ſuppoſe is, by his following words, *that he goes upon certain Principles, and we do not.* P. 240. We have already ſeen how certain his Principles have been, and I ſhould be ſomewhat aſhamed of my *Religion* if I had no better. But what our *Rule* of *Faith* is, hath been amply Diſcourſed already by you, and that in Mr. *S*'s *clearing Method*, that nothing is left for me to do, but to touch at what remains, and concludes this Anſwer. I had the better to illuſtrate the weakneſs of that Argument from *Oral Tradition*, brought an inſtance in that Caſe parallel, *viz.* that if one Ages delivering to another would prove that the Faith of Chriſt was in every Age unalterable, becauſe no Age did teſtifie any ſuch alteration to be in it; by the ſame Argument the World might be proved eternal, becauſe no Age did ever teſtifie to another, that the World was ever otherwiſe than it is. So that if Oral Tradition were only to be relied on, there could be no evidence given of the Worlds being ever otherwiſe than it is, and conſequently the World muſt be believed to have been always what we ſee it is. This, as far as I can Apprehend, is a clear and diſtinct Ratiocination, and purpoſely deſigned to prove that we muſt admit of other Rules to judge of Alterations in the *Church* by, beſides Oral Tradition. But Mr. *S.* (in his own

own Expreſſion) *ſtrangely roving from the Mark* I aimed at, profeſſes *there is not a Tittle in it parallel to his* Medium, *nay, that he never ſaw in his Life more Abſurdities couched in fewer Words.* But I muſt take all patiently from a Man *who ſtill Perches on the Specifical Nature of things, and never flags below the Sphere of Science.* Yet by his good leave, he either Apprehends not, or wilfully miſtakes my meaning; for my Argument doth not proceed upon the belief of the Worlds Eternity, which, in his Anſwer, he runs wholly upon as far as *Eighthly and Laſtly*, but upon the evidence of Oral Tradition as to no diſcernable alteration in any Age of it. For the Queſtion between us, is, whether in Matters of alteration in the Faith or Practice of the Church, we are bound to rely only on the Teſtimony of Oral Tradition; ſo that if no Age can be inſtanced in wherein any Alteration was made, and this delivered by that Age, then we are bound to believe there hath been no Alteration ſince *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* times; now I ſay, if this hold good, I will prove the World Eternal by the ſame Argument; taking this for our Principle, that we are bound to relie only on Oral Tradition in the Caſe, Originally derived from the Matter of Fact ſeen by thoſe of the firſt Age; for that which never was otherwiſe than it is, is Eternal; but we cannot know by Oral Tradition that the World ever was otherwiſe than it is; for no Age of the World can be inſtanced in, wherein we have any Teſtimony of any Alteration that was in it. Either then we muſt believe that the World ever was what it is, *i. e.* Eternal; or elſe we muſt ſay, that we are not to relie barely on Oral Tradition in this Caſe, but we muſt judge whether the World were made or no, by other *Mediums* of Scripture and Reaſon. And this was all which I aimed at, *viz.* to ſhew that where there is no evidence from Oral Tradition; yet if there be *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, there is ſufficient ground for our Faith to ſtand upon. And ſo I apply it to the preſent Caſe; though we could not prove barely from the *Tradition* of any one Age, that there had been any Alteration in the Faith or Practice of the *Church*; yet if I can prove that there hath been ſuch from *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, this is ſufficient for me to believe it. And now I dare appeal to the indifferent Reader, whether this be ſo *full of Abſurdities*, or it be ſuch a *rambling Chimerical Argument* (as he calls it,) *no two Pieces of which hang together with themſelves, or any thing elſe.* Which being expreſſions of as great Modeſty as Science, I am content Mr *S.* ſhould bear away the Honour of them and his Demonſtrations together.

P. 241.

P. 242.

P. 243.

§. 19.

The laſt thing he quarrels with me for, is, that I ſay, *if we can evidently prove, that there have been Alterations in the Church, then it is to no purpoſe to prove that impoſſible which we ſee Actually done. And this appears not only becauſe the Scripture ſuppoſes a Degeneracy in the Chriſtian Church, which could never be, if every Age of the Church did Infallibly believe and Practice as the Precedent up to Chriſt's Time did; but becauſe we can produce clear evidence that ſome things are delivered by the preſent Church, which muſt be brought in by ſome Age ſince the time of Chriſt; for which I refer the Reader to what I had ſaid about Communion in one kind, Invocation of Saints, and Worſhip of Images: In all which,* I ſay, *I had proved evidently that they were not in uſe in ſome Ages of the Chriſtian Church; and it is as evident that theſe are delivered by the preſent Church, and therefore this Principle muſt needs be falſe.* In Anſwer to this, Mr. *S.* wiſhes, *I would tell him firſt what Evidence means, whether a ſtrong Fancy, or a Demonſtration?* I mean that which is enough to perſwade a wiſe Man, who judges according to the cleareſt Reaſon, which I am ſure is more than ever his Demonſtrations will do. But it is a pleaſant

ſpectacle to ſee how Mr. *S.* lays about him, at my ſaying that the *Scripture* ſuppoſes a Degeneracy in the Chriſtian Church. *Incomparably argued*! ſaith he, *why, ſee we not the place? Does it evidently ſpeak of Faith, or Manners, the Univerſal Church, or particular Perſons? but be it in Faith, be it Univerſal, does it ſuppoſe this Degeneracy already paſt, which is only proper to your purpoſe, or yet to come? That is, does it ſay there muſt be a total Apoſtaſie in Faith before the Year 1664? Alas, he had forgot this.* Moſt incomparably Anſwered! For if the Degeneracy be in 1665. or any Years after, what becomes of Mr. *S*'s Demonſtration then, that no Errors could come into the Church but it ſeems his Demonſtration holds but till 1664. and I eaſily believe another Year will never believe the truth of it. But if ſuch a thing as a Degeneracy be poſſible, how then ſtands the Infallibility of Tradition, when there can be no Degeneracy without falling from the Doctrine and Practices of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*? But that ſuch a Degeneracy hath already been in that which calls itſelf the *Catholick Church*, and that both in Faith and Manners, I ſhall refer Mr. *S.* to the Learned Author of the late *Idea of Antichriſtianiſm* and *Synopſis Prophetica*, where he may find enough to perſwade him that his Demonſtration was far from holding ſo long as 1664. And now I leave the Reader to judge whether the foregoing Evidences againſt the Infallibility of *Oral Tradition*, or Mr. *S*'s Demonſtrations have the greater force of Reaſon in them. And if he will not *ſtoop* ſo far from the *height* of his *Perch*, as to take notice of what I have elſewhere ſaid, I am reſolved to let him ſee I am not at all concerned about it: I begin to underſtand him ſo well by this *Appendix*, that I can give my ſelf a reaſonable Account why he thought it not fit to med-
P. 244. dle with any other part of my Book. But if Mr. *Serjeant.* be reſolved not to Anſwer any of the Teſtimonies I there produce, unleſs *I ſingle them out, and print them at the end of this Anſwer*, (*i. e.* remove them from that evidence which attends them in the *Series* of the Diſcourſe) I can only ſay, he is the moſt imperious Anſwerer I have met with, who is reſolved never to deal with an Adverſary, but on his own unreaſonable Terms. Thus heartily wiſhing Mr. *S*'s Science as great as his Opinion of it, and a good effect of our Endeavours to promote the one, by removing the other, I am

Sir,

Your Affectionate Friend

and Servant,

Edward Stillingfleet.

FINIS.